THE MYSORE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

FOURTH DAY

Saturday, 4th March 1961.

The House met in the Assembly Hall, Vidhana Soudha, Bangalore; at Thirty minutes past Eight of the Clock.

MR. SPEAKER (Sri S. R. KANTHI, B.A., LL.B.,) in the Chair.

MOTION OF NO CONFIDENCE IN THE MINISTRY

MR. SPEAKER.—Before we take up the subject itself, I would like to know whether I should fix a time-limit. There are two things. One is time limit for the individual speeches, and second, the total time limit, *i.e.*, whether we should take a day or less than a day.

Sri C. M. ARMUGHAM.—Let us have three days and let there be no time-limit.

MR. SPEAKER.—There is also another point which I would like to make clear at this stage. After the discussion on this motion, the question arises whether we will be able to take up the same matter under the Motion of Thanks again. The Motion of Thanks has already been discussed for three days and under this motion, we are almost covering the same ground again. I, therefore, think that after discussing this motion, I will put the amendments and the motion of Thanks to the House immediatly without any more speeches.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, I have looked into the position and I do not think it will be repetitive in character. This motion only pertains to what is stated as no confidence in the present Minister, but so far as the motion of thanks is concerned, it is not in the nature of a motion of no confidence. It may be that the grounds on which the allegations are made may be somewhat overlapping, but the substantial motion does not pertain to the motion of thanks. The amendments that we have moved to the motion of thanks does not cover the same grounds as those of the motion of no confidence and so it cannot be said that the two are repetitive in character. If, however, you hold that the it is repetitive in character, then there is no room even for this motion of no confidence because we have already moved the amendments to the motion of thanks. If you hold that the two are repetitive in character, then somebody on the other side may take advantage of it and create difficulties for us on this side.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Chief Minister).—On our side, we are not going to take advantange of any situation and create any difficulties. The points covered are the same and so they can be discussed together and we can reply. After hearing the Leader of the Opposition, I find that there is no change in his tone, manner and also in the subject matter.

Mr. Speaker.—The real motion refers to "no confidence" in the Ministry and naturally that will be disposed of after due discussion. There is no question of no confidence afterwards because the matter will have been disposed of. Secondly, there are reasons and grounds which are being alleged by the Opposition party against the Govenment and I find that those matters are covered by the amendments also. Anyway, I will look into the whole thing and find out if the same matters have been discussed. Under Rule 52, a matter which has been already discussed cannot be allowed to be discussed again. That question cannot be opened with reference to the present motion.

Sri M. C. Narasimhan.—If that is so, even the motion of thanks cannot be allowed after this no-confidence motion. I do not know what is going to happen to this motion. If it is carried, there is no difficulty at all. Supposing it is not carried, then it means expression of confidence in the Ministry which is also substantially the same thing as contained in the motion of thanks and so there will be no necessity for the motion of thanks itself.

Mr. Speaker.—That is why I am taking up the no confidence motion just now. If it is carried, it will have its own consequences.

Sri V. Srinvasa Setty.—Are we bound by the grounds contained in the motion. Are we not allowed to discuss any other matters also under the motion?

Mr. Speaker.—You are bound by the grounds contained in the motion.

Sri C. M. Arumugham.—When we say we have no confidence, we can discuse any matter. It is not necessary that we must restrict to the grounds given in the motion. We have given only one or two instances. We can bring in 100 more instances under the motion.

Mr. Speaker.—We will see what happens.

ಶ್ರೀ ಶರಣಗೌಡ ಇನಾಮ್‌ದಾರ್.—ನಿನ್ನೆಯಿಂದ ಈ ವಂದನಾಸೂಚನೆಯ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೇವಲ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟವರಿಗೇ ಛಾನ್ಸ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಉಳಿದವರಿಗೆ ಛಾನ್ಸ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ಅಲೋ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ನಾನು ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನನಗೆ ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರ ಭಾಷಣದ ವಂದನಾನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶವಿದೆ. ನನಗೆ ಛಾನ್ಸ್‌ಕೊಡಿ. We may or may not support the motion, but we are forced to speak on the motion. We have been wanting to speak on policy matters contained in the Address of the Governor and so we want time. Four days were allotted. It is not our fault that the other motion has come in. If you allow the other motion to be discussed today, we are deprived of the fourth day for discussion of the motion of thanks. The other motion will be discussed and the Government will reply and after that according to your ruling, we may not have any

opportunity to speak on the policy matters in the Address. So, my submission to the Chair is that the 4th day allotted for discussion of the Motion of thanks must be retained and members must be allowed to speak on the motion then.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There are other opportunities also for members to take part in the debate. It is not necessary that they should take part in the debate on the Motion of thanks itself. Those who have not taken part in the debate on the Motion of thanks will be given chances subsequently on the discussion of the budget. At present, we are not concerned with that, we are concerned with the no confidence motion. Members may speak for or against it.

Before the debate on the motion of no confidence begins, I would like to say that I am inclined to put a time limit.

Sri SHARANGOWDA INAMDAR.—Rule 21 says that after a day has been allotted for discussion on the Governor's Address, only "a motion or motions for leave to introduce a Bill or Bills may be made and a Bill or Bills may be introduced on such day and other business of a formal character may be transacted on such day before the Assembly commences or continues the discussion on the Address". ವಂದನಾನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಬೇರೆ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Please read Rule 19 also. It says:

"On such day or days or part of any day, the Assembly shall be at liberty to discuss the matters referred to in such Address on a Motion of thanks moved by a Member and seconded by another Member."

So today, I have not put down the motion of thanks for discussion. I have put down the no confidence motion only. I am at liberty to give a day or days and also at liberty to appoint such and such a day for such a such business. Under Rule 19, I have the power. Rule 21 is not in contravention of Rule 19. It does not take away the power of the Speaker for appointing a day.

Sri S. SARANGOWDA (INAMDAR).–The motion of thanks to the Address by the Governor is different from the motion of no confidence against the Ministry. Because the two motions are different in character, they cannot be mixed up and Government may have very good opportunities to answer both. Recently, in U. P. After the motion of thanks was disposed of, the no confidence motion has been taken up. So, I think it is better these two motions are not mixed up. The no confidence motion may be taken up separately.

Mr. SPEAKER.—They are being taken up separately ; Where is the question of mixing up ? Rule 19 gives the power to the chair to appoint a day or days for discussion of certain matters, that is, matters, covered by the Motion of Thanks. For today I have not put down the Motion of Thanks ; but I have put down this, "no confidence motion" today. Where is the difficulty ? Rule 19 is clear.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE (Chikodi).—Rules 19 and 20 go together; they cannot be read separately. Therefore, when the Chair has provided three or four days in the Calendar for the motion of thanks, the motion of thanks has got to be disposed of. Rule 20 cannot be divorced with from Rule 19; they go together. Otherwise, Rule 20 has got some specific relation in Chapter V; it cannot be removed out of context and construed accordingly. Therefore, I agree with my friend Sri Sharangowda that Rules 19, 20 and 21 should be read together. Therefore, this no confidence motion cannot be introduced at present. The motion of thanks may be discussed and disposed of and thereafter, the learned Members who have brought the no confidence motion are welcome to move it and make their speeches. About 30 or 40 Members have given amendments to the motion of thanks for the Governor's Address. It is not necessary that every person who moves the amendment is entitled to speak on the subject.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What have the amendments got to do with this. I have understood the two points raised by the Member that Rules 19, 20 and 21 should be read together and he means to say that if there is a business of formal character, then only the day which is fixed for the motion of thanks can be changed. But the other point about the amendment does not arise now.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—The other day after a large number of Members, of the Opposition have finished speaking on the amendments, it has been pointed out on this side that they have no opportunity to speak on the motion of thanks. We have got a right to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I tell him that nobody from the Government side stood up for two days.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—That was because the Chair took a particular view. Yesterday, when the Deputy Speaker was in the Chair, he was pleased to give an opportunity to Sri Gnoakar to speak. The Honourable Members on the Opposition objected. Therefore, the Chair may be pleased to see that the procedure is kindly amended.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SETTY (Coondapur).—You are pleased to say that even if there are specific Rules 19, 20 and 21, the Speaker can re-allocate the work and take the matter of no confidence motion to-day. I humbly beg to differ from the Speaker on this point. When there is a specific provision for discussing a matter in the House, the Speaker, I submit, has no discretion to change the specific provision. When the provision is absent under the rules, the Speaker has of course complete discretion. I do not think the Speaker can over-ride the provisions. Rule 21 says under what circumstances other matters can be introduced during the discussion and it does not refer to no confidence motion at all. I think matters of formal character can be discussed during the discussion on the motion of thanks. No confidence motion is not a formal matter: this is certainly an independent and very serious matter that is going to be discussed. It is not such an unimportant formal matter as to be

thrown into a motion of thanks and give a variance. I think the Speaker cannot use discretion when there is a specific provision.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I can understand the arguments put forward by Sri Kothawale ; but I have not been able to understand the arguments of Sri Srinivasa Setty. After all, it was at the instance of the Opposition that I have fixed this day ; I wanted to give them all sorts of facilities to discuss completely and freely the points raised in the no confidence motion. But apart from that, I can only say that Rules 19, 20 and 21 should be read together ; there I agree. Rule 21 says that notwithstanding that a day has been allotted for discussion on the Governor's Address, some small matters are intercepted ; it means to say that when a day for the Motion of Thanks has been allotted, on that day we cannot also take up small matters. It only means to say that Members can also take small matters and then take the Motion of Thanks; matter of very formal character which may not take much of the time of the day and which is allotted for the Motion of Thanks may be taken. But, it does not take away the right of the Speaker to alter the day allotted for the Motion of Thanks.

9 A.M.

There are two things. One is, that when a day has been allotted for the Motion of Thanks, small matters can be taken and some time, can be utilised. It is Rule 21. It does not, at the same time, take away the right that has been vested in the Chair to alter the day which is allotted for the Motion of Thanks. I do not see any contravention in these two Rules. Rules 20 refers only to amendment which is not of much consequence so far as the main question is concerned.

Take Rule 19. It means that day or days have been allotted. I have the power to allot any day, to alter any day and put down any business at any time; that power is there. So, what I have done to-day is that I have altered the day which was allotted for the Motion of Thanks and put down the Motion of No-confidence instead. I do not see any contravention here.

The second point which was raised by my friend Sri Kothawale was not relevant to the issue. He thinks that I made it clear that I would give chances only to Members who had tabled the amendments. That is wrong. I never made such a statement, It so happened that only Members who had tabled amendments stood up and the other side did not take the opportunity. It was only when Sri Gaonkar stood up, this issue arose. I make it quite clear that there is no intention on the part of the Chair to shut out any Member from taking part in the debate. The Members who have tabled an amendment as well as others have got an equal right. Therefore, this question does not arise at all. If anybody argues that I gave chances only to Members who have tabled amendments it happened naturally: that was not my intention: only they stood up and not others. I cannot take the right of a Member to take past in the

(Mr. SPEAKER)

debate. I may make it clear that merely because a Member has tabled an amendment he cannot get a right automatically. It is a wrong impression.

So for as time limit is concerned, there are two things-the total time for the present Motion and the time limit in the case of each individual speaker. I am trying to fix a time limit for both. We can consider the total time later on but the frist point is that there should be some time imit in regarel to speeches.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ (ಚನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಿನ್ನೆಯ ದಿವಸ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಮಂಡಿಸಿರುವಂಥ ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಅದನ್ನು ಸಪ್ೋರ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ.........

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಹಾಗಲ್ಲ. ಮೊದಲು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಮ್ಮ ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಿ ಅನಂತರ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದ್ದುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು.

Motion of No Confidence in the Council of Ministers

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA.—I beg to move:

"That this House has no confidence in the Present Ministry for the following reasons;

(1) The Ministry have failed to tone up the administration at all levels to meet the growing demands of the State in several sectors of Governmental activity for securing efficiency in administration and quick despatch of work;

(2) In the Constitution of many Committees set by the Government of Mysore, more than 90% of the Members belong to the Ruling Party, out of all proportions to the needs of the situation and in utter disregard of healthy democratic conventions;

(3) The Ministry has failed to satisfactorily tackle the problems of unemployment and under employment during the Second Five-Year Plan;

(4) In the matter of industrialisation, the Government have been adopting a policy of discrimination against enterprising local industrialists and encouraging outsiders even when there is no dearth of local capacity to launch industrial enterprises, whether major, small-scale or rural and cottage industries;

(5) The Ministry has failed in its duty to maintain high academic standards in Education at all levels including the university and in regard to University Education and administration in particular, they have disowned responsibility for mal-administration;

(6) In the field of co-operation, the Ministry had deliberately favoured their own party men to dominate the several co-operative institutions and when glaring cases of misappropriation and defalcation of public funds were brought to their notice, they have refused to take timely and appropriate action to book the offenders. There is an

obvious tendency on their part to screen the offenders on party considerations;

(7) In respect of the Sharavathi Project, there have been many serious irregularities in calling for tenders, placing contracts and in the execution of several stages of work, which have involved the State. In wasteful expenditure running to lakhs and lakhs of rupees and the ministry has failed to institute even a proper enquiry by the Committee consisting of technical personnel and representatives of both Houses of Legislature;

(8) In the matter of Government owned and managed industries, no steps have been taken to assess the extent to which they have been functioning satisfactorily and to find out ways and means of minimising the losses incurred by them and of maximising industrial production. The ministry has failed to prevent atype of "Post Office Socialism that is developing in respect of the Public Sector Enterprises in Mysore.

(9) There have been occasions when unwarranted interference with the functioning of the Judiciary is abundantly in evidence and there is a wanton flouting of the authority of even the High Court of Mysore in not implementing their legal decisions;

(10) In the administration of Law and Order and particularly in Police matters, there is no sense of security in the mind of the average citizen in Mysore and respectable persons have been deliberately insulted, harassed and disgraced to satisfy the whims and fancies of those in authority. The number of murder cases that go undetected that end in acquittal and that do not even see the light of day is alarmingly on the increase, much to the discomfiture of peace loving citizens of the State. The Police who are to be the guardians of the rights and liberty of the average citizen and whose duty is to ensure safety and guard the property of the people are themselves active promoters of lawlessness,

(11) In matters of recruitment to the State Service, the State Public Service Commission which has a statutory existence is more often ignored and on the flimsiest of grounds, their recommendations are by-passed, just to favour the Members of the Ruling Party;

(12) The recent dicision of Government to expand the present Ministry by the addition of four Ministers is a deliberate attempt to cater to the whims and fancies of the dissident group in the Ruling Party. It is a clear evidence of the callousness of the present Ministry to respect the wishes of the Legislature and at any rate, it is contrary to democratic traditions. It is not in public interest nor is it in accordance with public policy and sound canons of administration.

(13) The recent Election to the Village Panchayats and to the Taluk Boards, as part of a scheme of democratic decentralisation, have clearly proved the dominating and undue influence of the Ruling party and their unwarranted interference in the normal processes of elections. The result has been that these time honoured institutions have become

(Sri B. K. PUTTARMAIYA)

hotbeds of petty politics and have endangered the peaceful atmosphere of these rural republics. The most alarming trend of this attitude of the Ministry is that these local-self-governing bodies have been used by them as agents for their political activity and for laying foundations for the General Election of 1962.—

(14) The activities of the Anti-Corruption Department bring light drominimently that needless harassment is being caused to high placed officers of Government on whimsical grounds, by those in authority, denying bare justice to them by placing them under suspension, even when circumstances do not warrant such extreme steps being taken. The Anti-Corruption Department has virtually reduced itself to the position of an engine of unreasonable oppression and annoyance to the officials and non-officials alike. It is being used as powerful weapon in the hands of Ministers and often times being positively misused;

(15) The recent sad spectacle of the dessident group in the Congress Ligislature Party levelling as many as 29 charges of corruption, inefficiency, mal-admmistretion, nepotism, etc,, etc., against the present Ministry and the subsequent approachment which culminated in the expansion of Ministry is a clear proof, if proof was needed of "Partners in Crime" trying to make up between themselves and reducing democracy farce".

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved.—

"That this House has no confidence in the Present ministry for the following reasons.—

(1) The Ministery have failed to tone up the administration at all levels to meet the growing demands of the State in several sectors of Governmental activity for seuring efficiency in administration and quick despatch of work;

(2) In the Constitution of many Committees set by the Government of Mysore, more than 90% of the Members belong to the Ruling Party, out of all proporation to the needs of the situation and in utter disregard of healthy democratic conventions;

(3) The Ministry has failed to satisfactorily tackle the problems of unemployment and underemployment during the second Five-Year Plan;

(4) In the matter of industialisation, the Government have been adopting a policy of discrimination against enterprising local industrialists and encouraging outsiders even when there is no dearth of local capacity to launch industrial eaterprises, whether major, small-scale or rural and cottage industries;

(5) The Ministry has failed in its duty to maintain high academic standards in Education at all levels including the University and in regard to University Education and administration in particular, they have disowned responsibility for mal-administration;

(6) In the field of co-operation, the Ministry had deliberately favoured their own party men to dominate the several co-operative institution and when glaring cases of misappropriation and defalcation of public funds were brought to their notice, they have refused to take timely and appropriate action to book the offenders. There is an obvious tendency on their part to screen the offenders on party considerations;

(7) In respect of the Sharavathi Project, there have been many serious irregularities in calling for tenders, placing contracts and in the execution of several stages of work, which have involved the State in wasteful expenditure running to lakhs and lakhs of rupees and the Ministry has failed to institute even a proper enquiry by a Committee consisting of technical personnel and representatives of both Houses of Legislature.

(8) In the matter of Government owned and managed industries, no steps have been taken to assess the extent to which they have been functioning satisfactorily and to find out ways and means of minimising the losses incurred by them and of maximising industrial production. The Ministry has failed to prevent a type of "Post Office Socialism" that is developing in respect of the Public Sector enterprises in Mysore;

(9) There have been occasions when unwarranted interference with the functioning of the Judiciary is abundantly in evidence and there is a wanton flouting of the authority of even the High Court of Mysore in not implementing their legal decisions;

(10) In the administration of Law and Order and particularly in police matters, there is no sense of security in the mind of the average citizen in Mysore and respectable persons have been deliberately insulted, harassed and disgraced to satisfy the whims and fancies of those in authority. The number of murder cases that go undetected and end in acquittal and that do not even see the light of day is alarmingly on the increase, much to the discomfiture of peace loving citizens of the State. The Police who are to be the guardians of the rights and liberty of the average citizen and whose duty is to ensure safety and guard the property of the people, are themselves active promoters of lawlessness;

(11) In matters of recruitment to the State Service, the State Public Service Commission which has a statutory existence is more often ignored and on the flimsiest of grounds, their recommendations are by-passed, just to favour the members of the Ruling Party;

(12) The recent dicision of Government to expand the present Ministry by the addition of four Ministers is a deliberate attempt to cater to the whims and fancies of the dissident group in the Ruling Party. It is a clear evidence of the callousness of the present Ministry to respect the wishes of the Legislature and at any rate, it is contrary to democratic traditions. It is not in public interest nor is it in accordance with public policy and sound canons of administration;

(Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA)

(13) The recent Election to the Village Panchayats and to the Taluk Boards, as part of a scheme of democratic decentralisation, have clearly proved the dominating and undue influence of the Ruling Party and their unwarranted interference in the normal processes of elections. The result has been that these time honoured institutions have become hotbeds of petty politics and have endangered the peaceful atmosphere of these rural republics. The most alarming trend of this attitude of the Ministry is that local self-governing bodies have been used by them as agents for their political activity and for laying foundations for the General Election of 1962;

(14) The activities of the Anti-Corruption Department bring to light prominently that needless harassment is being caused to high placed officers of Government on whimsicial grounds, by those in authority, denying bare justice to them by placing them under suspension, even when circumstances do not warrant such extreme steps being taken. The Anti-Corruption Department has virtually reduced itself to the position of an engine of unreasonable oppression and annoyance to the officials and non-officials alike It is being used as a powerful weapon in the hands of Ministers and often times being positively misused;

(15) The recent sad spectacle of the dissident group in the Congress Legislature Party levelling as many as 29 charges of corruption, inefficiency, maladministration, nepotism, etc., etc., against the present Ministry and the subsequent approachment which culminated in the expansion of Ministry is a clear proof, if proof was needed of "Partners in Crime" trying to make up between themselves and reducing Democracy to a farce.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I want to give 45 minutes to the mover.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಳವಾಗಲಿ...

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ತಮ್ಮ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ವೇಳೆಯೊಳಗೇ ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಮುಗಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ಮರೆಯಬೇಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಮೂವರಿಗೂ ಟೈಂ ಲಿಮಿಟ್ ಇದೆಯೇ? ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಒಂದು ಕನ್‌ವೆನ್‌ಷನ್, ಹಾಕ..........

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ (ಗುಬ್ಬಿ).—ಕಾಲ ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ನೇಮವನ್ನೂ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ಅನುಸರಿಸಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಹಾಗಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ನಾನು ಈಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಳದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ನಿರ್ಣಯವೇನಿದೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಆ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರೇ ಮೂವ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರು ಈಗಲೂ ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಳ ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ನಾನು ಈ ಮೋಷನನ್ನೇ ಮೂವ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ...

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಡಿ. ಜತ್ತಿ (ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).—ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಸೀವೀಗ ಭಾಷಣ ಮಾಡುವುದೇ ಬೇಡ. ನೇರವಾಗಿ ಮೋಷನ್ನನ್ನು ಓಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಕೋಣ.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, let the Mover of the Motion take 45 minutes and the other Members who have also tabled Motions which are not moved because of the comprehensiveness of the Motion moved, may take half an-hour. After all, it is a no confidence motion against the Ministry and it is the Members of the Cabinet that are expected to speak. There may be a difference of opinion on this matter, but I must say that it is in the history of Mysore Legislature that there has been a no confidence motion moved by the Opposition. We have to establish conventions. The Chief Minister has got to tell the Members of his party to put a restraint and let only the Ministers speak against the Motion. So, the Mover may be given 45 minutes and others half an hour.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, you may not fix the time limit here and now. As the debate progresses, you will have a better idea of the number of speakers and the likely way in which the debate progresses.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not going to take any risk, because, I understand, many Members are going to take part. in the discussion on this motion. It is not correct to say that only Ministers should speak and others should not. I give the Mover 45 minutes and other 20 minutes.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—One clarification Sir. This is a Motion placed before the whole House and there are Members on this side who want to show that they have got full confidence in the Ministry. It is not correct for Sri Mallaradhya to say that only the Ministers should reply. If we want to establish conventions, let us establish good cenventions and not bad conventions.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Does that mean that all the 14 Ministers and 6 Deputy Ministers will speak ?

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Even other Members who may want to participate may speak.

Mr. SPEAKER.—This is a motion as any other motion. It is a motion of which the House is seized. Any Member, from any side, has a right to speak. I cannot stifle any Member from taking part in the debate ; it may be on this or that side. I will follow a certain method by which Members will be satisfied so far as giving of chances is concerned. I cannot give chances only to Members of the opposition or of the ruling party.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ.ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದಲ್ಲಿ ನಂಬಿಕೆ ಇರುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಅಗ್ಗೆ ನೋ ಕಾನ್‌ಫಿಡೆನ್ಸ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ತರಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಯಾವ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದ ತತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ನಂಬಿಕೆಯಿಲ್ಲವೋ ಮತ್ತು ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಚಟುವಟಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಅಂಥ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದ ಮೇಲೆ ಇಂಥ

---

† Indicates that the remarks or speeches have not been revised by the Member concerned.

(ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ)

ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸದ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಕೇರಳ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ತತ್ವದ ಕೊಲೆಯಾದಾಗ, ಅನೇಕ ರೀತಿಯ ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ಪರಂಪರೆಯು ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ್ಗೆ ಅಂಥ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದ ಮೇಲೆ ಛಾರ್ಜ್ ಹಾಕಿ ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸದ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ತಂದು, ಜನತೆಯ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಕ್ಷಣ ಓಟು ಹಾಕದೆ ಇದ್ದರೂ ಸಹ ಜನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಮನ್ನಣೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರಕಾರದವರು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೈಹಾಕಿ ಅಂಥ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲವನ್ನು ಡಿಸ್‌ಮಿಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದುಂಟು. ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹುಮತ ಬೆಂಬಲವಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪಕ್ಷವು ಅಧಿಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿರುವುದು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾದ ನಿಯಮ. ಅಧಿಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಂಥ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹುಮತ ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ದೊರೆಯುವುದು. ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಅಧಿಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿರುವವರಿಗೆ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯ ಬಹುಮತ ಸಿಕ್ಕೇ ಸಿಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಈ ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸದ ಸೂಚನೆ ಫೇಲ್ ಆಗಬಹುದು. ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಶೇಷವೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದಾಗ್ಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೆ ಗಣನೀಯವಾದ ಬಹುಮತ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಬೆಂಬಲವಿದ್ದದ್ದರೆ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇಂಥ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅದೇನೂ ಅಂಥ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಪ್ರಮೇಯವಾಗಿರುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹುಮತ ಬೆಂಬಲವಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪಕ್ಷವು ಅಧಿಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿರುವಾಗ ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ತರುವುದು ಎಂದರೆ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಜನತೆಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಏನು ಇದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿಯೇ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ತತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಗುಣವಾಗಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲವು ರಾಜಿನಾಮೆ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಒಂದು ಸತ್ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇಂಗ್ಲೆಂಡ್ ಮುಂತಾದ ದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸದ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ತರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಬ್ಬ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯು ಏನಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ತಪ್ಪು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅಂಥ ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಾಗ್ಗೆ ಆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲವೇ ಆಗಲಿ ರಾಜಿನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥಾ ನಿದರ್ಶನಗಳಿವೆ. ಈಗ ಏನಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದರೆ 1957ರಿಂದ ಈಚೆಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲವು ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ತತ್ವವನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿಹಿಡಿಯುವುದರ ಬದಲು ಅದರ ಕೊಲೆ ನಿತ್ಯ ಆಗುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿಯ ಜನತೆಯ ನಂಬಿಕೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ. ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ಯಶಸ್ವಿಯಾಗಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲವು ರಾಜಿನಾಮೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು, ಮತ್ತು ತಕ್ಷಣ ಪ್ರೆಸಿಡೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ರೂಲ್ ಜಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಂದು ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಚುನಾವಣೆ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕು. ಯಾಕೆಂದರೆ ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲವು ಚುನಾವಣೆಯ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿರುವುದಾದರೆ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳು ನ್ಯಾಯವಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯಲಾರವು. ಇವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಧಿಕಾರದ ಪ್ರಭಾವ ಬೀರಿ ದುರುಪಯೋಗ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಮತ್ತು ಗ್ರಾಮಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇವರ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳು ಪ್ರಭಾವ ಬೀರಿದ ಅನುಭವ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಇಂಥ ನಿದರ್ಶನ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದ ನೇತೃತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳು ನೇರವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುವುದು ಯೋಗ್ಯವಲ್ಲ. ಯಾಕೆಂದರೆ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಅಪನಂಬಿಕೆ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಜನತೆಗೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದಲೇ ಈ ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈಗ ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲ ರದ್ದು ಆಗಬೇಕು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೆಲವು ಕಾರಣಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆಡಳಿತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಇರಬೇಕಾದ ದಕ್ಷತೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಸರಿಯಾದ ದಕ್ಷತೆ ಇದ್ದಿದ್ದರೆ ಎರಡು ಯೋಜನೆಗಳ ಕಾಲಾವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಲಾಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದ ಹಣ ಖರ್ಚು ಆಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಇದೊಂದೇ ನಿದರ್ಶನ ಸಾಕು, ಎಂದು ನನಗೆ ಅನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಎರಡೂ ಯೋಜನೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣ ಉಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ನಿಗದಿಯಾದ ಹಣ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಹಣಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅದರ ಬದಲು ಏನಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದರೆ ದಕ್ಷತೆಯಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಹಣ ಉಳಿತಾಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದೊಂದೇ ನಿದರ್ಶನ ಸಾಕು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಷಯ ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಯಾವ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ದಲ್ಲಿ ದೇಶದ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ತಜ್ಞರು ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತ ರಾದ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಗಳಿಂದ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನಾಗಿ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯ. ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ದೇಶದ ಅಭ್ಯುದಯಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಂಥ ಸತ್ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸದೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿಯು ಅದರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ತಮ್ಮ ಗುಂಪಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದವ ರನ್ನಷ್ಟೇ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನಾಗಿ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಲಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಹಿಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯ ನವರ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲವಿರುವಾಗ್ಗೆ ಕೊನೆಯ ಪಕ್ಷ ಶೇ. 40 ಭಾಗ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿರುವವರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಶೇಕಡ 95 ಭಾಗ ಮತ್ತು ಕೆಲವು ಸಾರಿ ನೂರಕ್ಕೆ ನೂರರಷ್ಟು ಭಾಗ ತಮ್ಮ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನೇ ಕಮಿಟಿಗಳಿಗೆ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕಮಾಡದೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಪಕ್ಷದವರನ್ನೇ ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಡಿಸ್ಕ್ರಿಮಿನೇಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಗಳ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ತತ್ವದ ಕೊಲೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ. ಕೇರಳ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಮ್ಯೂನಿಸ್ಟ್ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲವಿದ್ದಾಗ ಕಮ್ಯೂನಿಸ್ಟ್ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಕಮಿಟಿಗಳಿಗೆ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಸರಕಾರದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯ ಆಗುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು ಎಂದು ಭಾರೀ ಮೊತ್ತ ಛಾರ್ಜ್ ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲವನ್ನು ಕೇರಳ ದಲ್ಲಿ ಡಿಸ್‌ಮಿಸ್ ಮಾಡಲಾಯಿತು. ಕೇರಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಕಮ್ಯೂನಿಸ್ಟರು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೋ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರು ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿಗರು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕಮಿಟಿಗಳಿಗೂ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿಗರನ್ನೇ ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒಡ ಬೊರೇಗೌಡನ ಖಜಾನೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯ ಹಣವನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯ ಚಟುವಟಿಕೆಯ ಬೆಳವಣಿಗೆಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕಮಿಟಿಗಳ ಮೂಲಕ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದನ್ನು ಕಂಡು ಕೇರಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರಕಾರ ಕೈಹಾಕಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲವನ್ನು ಡಿಸ್‌ಮಿಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಸಹ ಯಾವುದೇ ಒಂದು ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೂ ಸಹ ತಮ್ಮ ಜನರನ್ನೇ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಖಾದಿ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಬರೀ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್‌ನವರೇ ಖಾದಿ ಹಾಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆಯೆ ? ಖಾದಿಗೆ ಪ್ರೋತ್ಸಾಹ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಷ್ಟವಿದ್ದವರು ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಏಕೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ! ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿ, ಅದರ ಮೂಲಕ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ವಿನಿಯೋಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ನ್ಯಾಯವಾದ ಕಾರಣ ಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಖಾದಿ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆನ್ನುವುದಾದರೆ ಎಲ್ಲ ಪಕ್ಷದವರನ್ನೂ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯ ರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಹಾಕಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು, ಇದೇನೋ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ತಲೆಕೆಳಕು ಮಾಡುವಂಥ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಾಗಲೀ, ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಆಗಲೀ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಆಡಳಿತನೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಖಾದಿಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬರನ್ನೂ ನಿಮ್ಮವರನ್ನೇ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ.

Flying School ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿರುವುದರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದವರನ್ನೇ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್‌ನವರಿಗೇ Flying ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಲಹೆ ಕೊಡುವ ಸಾಮರ್ಥ್ಯವಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಏನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಇತರರೂ ವಿಮಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಯಾಣ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ; ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಿಳುವಳಿಕೆ ಯಿರುವವರೂ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ನಿಮ್ಮವರೇ ಎಲ್ಲ ತಿಳಿದವರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ನಿಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ತಜ್ಞರಾಗಿರುವವರನ್ನು ಯಾರನ್ನಾದರೂ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದೀರಾ ? ಆ ರೀತಿ ಇತರರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರೂ ತಜ್ಞರಿಲ್ಲದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮವರನ್ನೇ ಹಾಕಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬಂತು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ನಾವು ಮಾತನಾಡು ವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೊರಗಿನಿಂದ ತಜ್ಞರನ್ನು ತಂದು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಕೂಡ ನಾವು ವಿರೋಧ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ)

ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಶರಾವತಿ ಯೋಜನೆಗೆ ಹೊರಗಿನಿಂದ ಒಬ್ಬ ತಜ್ಞರನ್ನು adviser ಆಗಿ ತಂದಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ವಿರೋಧಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೊರಗಿನಿಂದ ಬೇರೆಯವರನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂದು ನಾವು ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂಡ ವಿರೋಧಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ತಜ್ಞರಾದವರು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರನ್ನೂ, ಅನುಭವಸ್ಥರನ್ನೂ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಇದೊಂದೂ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ, ತಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಪ್ರಜಾ ಪ್ರಭುತ್ವವನ್ನೂ ಕೊಲೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ.

Economy and Resources Committee ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನಾಗಿ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಲು ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಬುದ್ಧಿಯಿದ್ದವರು ಯಾರೂ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಡಿ. ಜತ್ತಿ.—ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದವರನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅವರನ್ನೂ ಬಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರೇನು ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಹಾಕಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಬಡಿ ಎಂದೂ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಯಾವ ವಿಧದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಬುದ್ಧಿ ಇಲ್ಲದವರಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಏನಾದರೂ ಕೈವಾದ ಮಾಡುವವರಲ್ಲ. ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿರಲು ಯಾವಯಾವ ಗುಣಗಳಿರಬೇಕೋ ಅವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಹೊಂದಿರುವ ಸದಸ್ಯರೊಬ್ಬರನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಆದರೆ ಪ್ರಾತಿನಿಧ್ಯವೆಷ್ಟಿರಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತೋ ಅಷ್ಟಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದ ವಿಷಯವಲ್ಲ. ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯ. ಅಂಥದ್ದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ ಪ್ರಮಾಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾತಿನಿಧ್ಯ ದೊರಕಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತೋ ಅಷ್ಟು ದೊರಕಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯನವರು ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದಾಗ, ಸುಮಾರು ಏಳು ಜನರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದರ ಪೈಕಿ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಜನರನ್ನೂ, ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್‌ನವರನ್ನೂ ಹಾಕಿ, ಮೂರು ಜನರನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದಿಂದ ಹಾಕುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಇತರ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಇದೇ ರೀತಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಕೇಂದ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂಡ ಇದೇ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಕೆಲವರಿಗೆ Chairmanships ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇವರು ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತರಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತರಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂದು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಾ ? Handloom ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ, Small-scale and rural industries ಗೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಶಿವಪ್ಪನವರನ್ನು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅವರು ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತರಲ್ಲವೆಂದ ಅಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತರಿಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ವಿದ್ಯುಚ್ಛಕ್ತಿ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಟಿ. ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯನವರನ್ನು ಛೇರ್‌ಮನ್ ಆಗಿ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯನವರ ಸ್ವಂತ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಏನೂ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಬಹುಕಾಲದಿಂದ ನನಗೆ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು. ಆದರೆ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ತತ್ವದ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ತಾವು ರಾಜ್ಯಭಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ತತ್ವಕ್ಕನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ "ನೀವು ನಮಗೆ ಬೇಕಿಲ್ಲ" ಎಂದು ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಜನ ತಿಳಿಸಿದರು. ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಮನುಷ್ಯ ನಮಗೆ ಬೇಡ ಎಂದು ಜನ ತಿಳಿಸಿದರೋ ಅಂಥವರನ್ನು ಜನರ ಮೇಲೆ force ಮಾಡಿ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇದನ್ನು ಯಾವ ತತ್ವಕ್ಕನುಗುಣವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಹಾಗೇನಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ತತ್ವವನ್ನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರೆ, ಹರಿಜನೋದ್ಧಾರ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಇವರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆನ್ನುವುದಾದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ದಾನಪ್ಪನವರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರನ್ನೂ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ದಾನಪ್ಪನವರು ಅವರಿಗಿಂತ ಯಾವ ವಿಧದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕಡಮೆಯಿಲ್ಲ.

Co-operative Development Boardಗೆ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಜಿ. ನಾರಾಯಣಗೌಡರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇವರು ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡುವವರಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಜನ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದರು. ಇಂಥವರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ?

ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಎ. ಜಿ. ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರರಾಯರು ನಿವೃತ್ತ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪರಾಭವಗೊಂಡವರು. ಇವರಿಂದ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇವರನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಜನ ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ......

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನೀವು ಹಾಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ತತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ನಡಯುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಯಾರು ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾಗಲಲ್ಲವೋ ಅಂಥವರನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಏನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಪುಷ್ಟೀಕರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ instances ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೋತಿರುವವರನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಲ್ಲ.

† Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I rise to a point of order. Is it open to a Member of this House to talk of the Chairman of a party who is not a Member of this House ? He cannot insult our Chairman who is not a Member of this House. I am saying this when mentioning the names of Chirmen of Committees who are appointed by the present Ministry. It is a matter which is well known and which is done by the Ministry. How does a matter in which our Chairman is elected or appointed come into the discussion of this House, I am asking. It is entirely outside the purview of the discussion in this House. It is nothing but insulting the Chairman of a recognised political party.

9-30 A.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The point has been carried too far. It is open to a Member to say that the Government have appointed persons who were defeated in the general elections. It is not necessary to mention names. It must be mentioned in such a way as to make the whole thing intelligible without mentioning names. While saying that a person has been defeated in the elections, it is not good for the Member to cast aspersions on an outsider. He can say that a certain person was defeated in the elections and still he was taken as Chairman of a Board of Committee. In saying that it is not fair to use such words as will reflect on the character and public conduct of the person concerned.

When some retorts are made, they should be taken as retorts. In such matters we cannot be too rigid. I have always taken the opportunity to tell Members that they should never cast aspersions on an outsider. When I say that Sri Puttaramaiya should not cast any aspersion on an outsider, I mean that Sri Ramaiah also should not do it.

†Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I want the Speaker to give a ruling on my point. The appointment of Sri Ramachandra Rao was the subject matter of an action of the Government and so Sri Puttaramaiya has a right to refer to it though he need not have mentioned the name as you said. In that case, the thing was well known and it was published in papers also, but here is a case where the name of the Chairman of our Party who has nothing to do with this House is dragged in here and aspersions are cast against him. It is very unfair. Either the Hon'ble Member should withdraw it or I want you to give a ruling on it.

Sri G. DUGGAPPA.—Similarly, the name of Sri Narayanagowda was dragged in here. He has nothing to do with the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I request Members not to drag in the names of outsiders here so far as possible. Of course, the actions of Government are a relevant factor here and to that extent the Government may be criticised but the organisational matters of par ies are not to be brought in here as they are outside the purview of the Legislature. To say that a certain person who was defeated in elections is also the head of the organisation is not in good taste. We are not concerned with the person who is the head of the organisation because he has nothing to do with the Legislature party here.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—When the leader of the Opposition was making a remark about persons defeated in elections being appointed as Chairman of Boards and Committees, he also wanted to pose the question whether those persons possessed the prescribed qualifications for such statutory appointments.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He is trying to suggest something new to Sri Puttaramaiya.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಈಗ ತಾವೇ ರೂಲಿಂಗು ಕೊಟ್ಟರಿ, ಹೊರಗಡೆಯವರ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೇಚರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು. ಅದು ಸರಿ. ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿ ವಿಚಾರ.

ಈಗ ಕೇರಳದಲ್ಲಿ Coalition Ministry ಇದೆ. ಚೀಫ್ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರು ನಮ್ಮ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರಾಗಿದ್ದರೂ, ಅವರು ಯಾರನ್ನಾದರೂ Defeated persons ನ್ನು ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಕಿರುವ ಒಂದು ಉದಾಹರಣೆ ಇದೆಯೇ, ಒಬ್ಬ ಛೇರ್ಮನ್ನನ್ನು ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಉದಾಹರಣೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಇದೆಯೇ ? ಅಥವಾ ಬೇರಾವ ಸ್ಟೇಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಲಿ Defeated persons ಗಳನ್ನು ಚುನಾಯಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಿಯಮವನ್ನೇನಾದರೂ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಾ ? ಪಾರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದವರೆಂದು ಛೇರ್ಮನ್ನರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಮತ್ತು ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೇಚರಿಗೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಸಂಬಂಧವಿರುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ? ತಾವು ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಮುಖ ಒರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ, ಅದರಿಂದ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೇನು ಉಪಯೋಗವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ? ಹೀಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ಕಮಿಟಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ, ಅನೇಕ ಬೋರ್ಡುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ತರಹ ತಮ್ಮ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯ ಉಪಯೋಗಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ತಮ್ಮ ಪಾರ್ಟಿ ಜನಗಳನ್ನು ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದು, ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದ ಕೊಲೆ ಮಾಡಿದಂತಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದರಿಂದಾಗಿ ನನಗೆ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದಲ್ಲಿ ನಂಬಿಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಇಂಡಸ್ಟ್ರಿಯ ಪಾಲಿಸಿ ನೋಡಿದರೂ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ Descriminate ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಪ್ರಜಾ ಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳಿಂದ ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಸರಕಾರದ ಮಂತ್ರಿ

ಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆರಿಸಿ ಬಂದಮೇಲೆ ಯಾವಪಕ್ಷ ಮೆಜಾರಿಟಿ ಪಕ್ಷವಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಆ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಆಡಳಿತ ನಡೆಸಲು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿ ಚುನಾಯಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಮಂತಿಗಳು ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬ ಪ್ರಜೆಗೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಮರೆಯಬಾರದು. ಒಂದೇ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಲ್ಲ. ಇಡೀ ದೇಶದ ಜನತೆಗೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಆಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಜನತೆಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲಮಾಡಿಕೊಡದೆ, ಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ಸೌಕರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುತ್ತಾ ಇತರ ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ಸೌಕರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ Descreminate ಮಾಡುವುದು ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದ ತತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾದುದು.

ಇಂಡಸ್ಟ್ರಿಯಲ್ ಪಾಲಿಸಿ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಈಚೆಗೆ ಚನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣದ ಸ್ಪನ್‌ಸಿಲ್ಕು ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರಿಯನ್ನು ಈಗ ಸರಕಾರದವರು ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಂಡಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಮಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆಸುವಾಗ ಯಾರು ಹಿಂದೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೋ ಅಂತಹವರು ಕೆಲಸವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಬೀದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಂತಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಯಾರು ಹಿಂದೆ ಅನ್ಯಾಯ, ಪಕ್ಷಪಾತನೀತಿಮಾಡಿ ಹಿಂದೆ ಡಿಸ್‌ಮಿಸ್ಸು ಆಗಿ, ಯಾರು ಕಷ್ಟತನಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣರಾಗಿದ್ದರೋ ಅಂತಹವರನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ತಂದು ಪುನಃ ಅಪಾಯಿಂಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟು ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ನಿದರ್ಶನಗಳಿವೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈಗಲಾದರೂ ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರಾ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಪಕ್ಷಪಾತ ಮನೋಭಾವವುಳ್ಳ ಜನರು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದಲ್ಲಿ ನನಗೆ ನಂಬಿಕೆಯಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾಗಾರ್ಜುನ ಕಂಪೆನಿ ಎನ್ನುವ ಒಂದು ಕಂಪೆನಿಗೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರಕಾರದ ಪರ್ಮಿಷನ್ನು ಇಂಡೋಕಾರ್ಸಿನ್ Medicated wine ಮಾಡಲು ಮತ್ತು ಮಾರಲು ಸಿಕ್ಕಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಸಾವಿರಾರು ಬಾಟಲುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಇದನ್ನು Prohibited Area ದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾರಿದಾಗ, ಈ ಸಾವಿರ ಬಾಟಲುಗಳು Medicated ಅಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಸರಕಾರ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಲೈಸನ್ಸನ್ನು ವಜಾಮಾಡಿದೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿಯಿತು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತದೋ ನೋಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ಕೋಆಪರೇಷನ್ನು ಶಾಖೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಕೇರಳ ಸರಕಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಏನೇನು Charges ಗಳಿದ್ದವೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಆಗಿನ ಕಮ್ಯೂನಿಸ್ಟು ಸರಕಾರದ ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಮೇಲೆ ಹೊರಿಸಿದ್ದರೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನೂರರಷ್ಟು ಇಂದಿನ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರಕಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೊರಿಸಬಹುದು. ಕಮ್ಯೂನಿಸ್ಟು ಸರಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿದುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರಕಾರದ ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಷನ್ನಿನ ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಇದು ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದು ತಪ್ಪಾಗಲಾರದು. ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಜಾ ಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದ ತತ್ವದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಿ ಆರಿಸಿ ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿರಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಈ ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಮೂವ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿನಿಂದ ದೇಶದ ಬೆಳವಣಿಗೆಯಾಗಬೇಕು, ದೇಶದ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗಬೇಕು. ಬಂಡವಾಳಗಾರರಿಂದ ಜನ ಹೊರಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕು. ಈ ಕೊ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಮೂವ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಜನರು ತಂತಮ್ಮ ಕಾಲಿನ ಮೇಲೆಯೇ ನಿಲ್ಲುವಂತಾಗಬೇಕು. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರು ಇರಬೇಕೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಮೊದಲು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರು. ಆದರೆ ಈಚೆಗೆ 3-4 ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಕೇವಲ ನಾಮಿನೇಟೆಡ್ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರ್ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನು? ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರನ್ನೇ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕಡೆಯೂ ನಾಮಿನೇಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶದ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ)

ಕೊ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಮೂವ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿನಿಂದ ಜನತೆಗೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾದ ಹಣ ತಮ್ಮ ಪಾರ್ಟಿ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷದವರ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಲ್ಲುವಂತೆ ಏರ್ಪಾಟು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೇಗಾದರೂ ಆಗಲಿ, ಅವರ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗಬೇಕು. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ಈ ಕೊ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಅದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಈಚೆಗೆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಮತ್ತು ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿ ಚುನಾವಣೆ ನಡೆವಾಗ ಆಗಲೂ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ನಾಮಿನೇಟೆಡ್ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರ್ಸ್ ಮೂಲಕವೇ ಹಂಚಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ತತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ವಿರೋಧವಾದುದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಒಂದೇ ಒಂದು ಉದಾಹರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಚನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣದ ಕೊ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ಬೈಲಾದಲ್ಲಿರುವುದು, ಒಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಎಲೆಕ್ಟೆಡ್ ಮೆಂಬರುಗಳು ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮಾಡಿದೆ. ಮತ್ತೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಇಂಟರೆಸ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ಕಾಪಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರ್ಸ್‌ನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ನಾಮಿನೇಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇದೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಇರುವಾಗ ಅದನ್ನು ಸಸ್ಪೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ಮತ್ತೆ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರುಗಳನ್ನು ನಾಮಿನೇಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಎಲೆಕ್ಟೆಡ್ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರ್ಸಿಗೆ ಕೊ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನು ಇಂಟರೆಸ್ಟ್ ಇದೆಯೋ ಅದು ನಾಮಿನೇಟೆಡ್ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರ್ಸಿಗೆ ಇರಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಇದೆ. ಕೊ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಯಾವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಡೀಲ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತದೋ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾಮಿನೇಟೆಡ್ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರುಗಳ ಇಂಟರೆಸ್ಟ್ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲೂ ಇರಬಾರದು ಎಂದಿದೆ. ಯಾವ ಸದಸ್ಯರೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಅಂತಹ ಇಂಟರೆಸ್ಟ್ ಹೊಂದಿದ್ದರೂ ಆ ಕೊ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಬೆಳವಣಿಗೆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವರ್ಷೇ ವರ್ಷೇ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗಬಹುದು. ಎಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷದವರ ಇಂಟರೆಸ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅನಾನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೋ ಎಂಬ ಭಾವನೆಯಿಂದ ತಮ್ಮ ಪಾರ್ಟಿ ಕಡೆಯವರನ್ನೇ ಈ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ನಾಮಿನೇಟೆಡ್ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರುಗಳನ್ನಾಗಿ ನೇಮಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒಂದು ಉದಾಹರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಕೊ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಜಾಗ ಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಪಕ್ಕದ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಅಕ್ವೈರ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ಆಗ ಯಾವ ನಾಮಿನೇಟೆಡ್ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇದ್ದರೋ ಅವರು ಆ ನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡರು. ಪುನಃ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಪಾಸಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಯಾವ ಆ ಒಂದು ಜಾಗವಿತ್ತೋ ಅದನ್ನು ನಾಮಿನೇಟೆಡ್ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರ್ ಆದವರೇ ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಂಡು ಆ ಜಾಗವನ್ನು 1 ಸಾವಿರದಿಂದ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಸಾವಿರಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಮನೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಕೊ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಜಾಗವನ್ನು ಆ ಪ್ರಕಾರವೇ ಲೋಕಲ್ ಸೆಲ್ಫ್ ಗವರ್ನ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಸಹ ಅಕ್ವೈರು ಮಾಡಿದೆ. ಕೊ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಯೂ ಸಹ ಈ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಇಂಡಿವಿಜುಯಲ್‌ಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು, ಸೊಸೈಟಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಿಲ್ಲ, ಈಗ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಗೆ ಇರುವುದೇ ಸಾಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಕೊ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಮೂವ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಇಂಟರೆಸ್ಟ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಇಂಡಿವಿಜುಯಲ್‌ಗೆ ಜಮೀನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಕೊ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಗೆ ಬೇಡ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ಸರಿಯಾದುದಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಿಂದ ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಇವರು ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ತತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೋ ಎಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಪಾರ್ಟಿ ಇಂಟರೆಸ್ಟ್ ಇವರಲ್ಲಿ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಇದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವವನ್ನು ಕೊಲೆ ಮಾಡಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಬೆಳವಣಿಗೆಗಾಗಿ ತಮಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಸೊಸೈಟಿಗೆ ನಾಮಕರಣ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದಲ್ಲಿ ನನಗೆ ನಂಬಿಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಜಡ್ಜ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಕೈಹಾಕುವುದು ತಪ್ಪು. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಆಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷ ಜುಡಿಷಿಯರಿ ಪಾರ್ಟಿ ಇಂಟರೆಸ್ಟ್‌ಗಿಂತ ಮೇಲಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿರಬೇಕು. ಅಂಥಾದ್ದರಲ್ಲಿ ಜಡ್ಜ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಕೈ ಹಾಕಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಮನೋಭಾವ ಜಡ್ಜ್‌ಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ? ಜುಡಿಷಿಯರಿ ಚರಿತ್ರೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಜಡ್ಜ್‌ಗಳಿಗೆ ತಾವು ಇಂತಹ ಪಾರ್ಟಿ, ಅಂತಹ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನೇಮಕವಾದದು ಎಂಬ ಶಂಕೆಯುಂಟಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಏಕೆ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು? ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಇವರು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಆ ಕೆಲಸಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೈಹಾಕುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ನ್ಯಾಯ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾದುದು ಮತ್ತು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಕೆಲವು ಕೇಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಹ ವಿತ್‌ಡ್ರಾ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟ್ ನವರು ಮಾಡಿದ ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿಯೂ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಉದಾಹರಣೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಬಿಜಾಪುರದಲ್ಲಿ ಜೀವಾವಧಿ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆಗೆ ಗುರಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದಂತಹವನಿಗೆ ಕ್ಷಮಾದಾನಕೊಡುವಂತೆ ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರಿಗೆ ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಒತ್ತಾಯಮಾಡಿದೆ.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—It is a right under the constitution. There is no question of withdrawal of any case.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಇದೇ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಒಂದು ಛಾರ್ಜಿನ ಮೇಲೆಯೇ ಕೇರಳ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಡಿಸ್‌ಮಿಸ್ ಆದುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಎಂ. ಆರುಮುಗಂ.—ಈಗಲೂ ನಾವೇ ಅವರನ್ನು ವಜಾ ಮಾಡೋಣ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಡಿ. ಜತ್ತಿ.—ಶ್ರೀ ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯನವರೇ, ನೋಡೋಣ, ನೀವು ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿ.

(ನಗು.)

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಡಿಸ್‌ಮಿಸ್ ನಾವು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದೇನಲ್ಲ. ನೀವೇ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಸಾಕು. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಆತ್ಮಕ್ಕೆ ತಿಳಿದಿರುವ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ನೀವೇ ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಡಿ. 1953 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಆಂಧ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ತಂದಾಗ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಸದಸ್ಯರಂತೆ ಅವರು ಹೆದರಿಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಕೆಲವು ಮಂದಿ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿಗರೇ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಓಟುಮಾಡಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ನಾಲ್ಕೈದು ದಿನಗಳ ಮೊದಲೇ ಈ ತರಹ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಆಂಧ್ರದ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಆಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಇವತ್ತು ಆ ರೀತಿ ಆಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಷ್ಟ ಅಷ್ಟೇ. ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಡಮೆ ಇರಬಹುದು. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮೇಲೆ ನಾನು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಛಾರ್ಜು ತಮಗೆ ನ್ಯಾಯವೆಂದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದರೆ, ನಿಮ್ಮ ಆತ್ಮಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಜವೆಂದು ಗೊತ್ತಾದರೆ, ನೀವೇ ಕೆಲಸ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಹೋಗುತ್ತೀರಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಅಣ್ಣಾರಾವ್ ಗಣಮುಖಿ (ವಿದ್ಯಾ ಶಾಖೆಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).—ನಮ್ಮ ಮೇಲೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬಿಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಅದೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಆತ್ಮಕ್ಕೆ ಬಿಡುತ್ತೇವೆ.

ಪೋಲೀಸು ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಿರುವಷ್ಟು ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ಎಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಇಷ್ಟು ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾರು ಫೆಸ್ಟಿವಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸುವ ಒಂದು ಹಕ್ಕು ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗಿತ್ತು. ಆ ಉತ್ಸವದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅವರು ರಜ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದು ಏನು ತಪ್ಪು? ಶಾಂತ ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳನ್ನು ಉದ್ರೇಕಗೊಳಿಸಿ ವೃಥಾ ಉದ್ರೇಕಗೊಳಿಸಿ ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಗುಂಡ ಹಾರಿಸಿದಿರಿ. ಎರಡು ದಿವಸಗಳ ರಜ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ಆಗಿತ್ತು. ರಜ ಕೊಡದಿದ್ದುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ತಪ್ಪು. ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳ ತಪ್ಪಲ್ಲ. ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಗುಂಡು ಹಾರಿಸಿದಿರಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಡಿ. ಜತ್ತಿ.—ಅರೇಂಜ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡದಿದ್ದುದು ಯಾರ ತಪ್ಪು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ತಮ್ಮವರದು, ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರದು.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, that is a very low type of insinuation.

Sri B.D. JATTI.—No Sir; I protest. I have a right to say it.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—It is a very low type of insinuation.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—No Sir. What I say is correct. It is the failure of the person who was in charge of the arrangement and not of the Government.

Sri J.B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I was not in charge of law and order. It is a simple matter which the Government has failed to understand.

Sri G. DUGGAPPA.—Sir, I rise to a point of order.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, the Hon'ble Member is not in his seat and how can he rise to a point of order sitting somewhere?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will look to it.

Sri G. DUGGAPPA.—The point of order is, the Youth Festival is a matter with which the Government has nothing to do. So, the Hon'ble Member cannot put forth a thing other than the fact. He cannot say anything to mislead the House.

(Several Members rose.)

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು:—ಕುಳಿತು ಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ. ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದು ವರಿಸಿ ಹೋಗಿಬಿಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

(Intrruption)

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sii Puttaramaiya has done well. He is yielding. But what is all this? ಉಳಿದವರು ಏಕೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡುವವನು ನಾನು, ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಹೋಗಿಬಿಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. If this continues, I will take a very very serious notice. It is not fair. A point of order is raised and it is for the chair to look to it. Why should another Member pass that it is not a point of order?

ಶ್ರೀ ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ನೀವು ಹೊರಟುಹೋದಮೇಲೆ ಯಾರನ್ನು ಕೇಳುವುದು ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ನಿಜ, ನಾನು ಹೊರಟು ಹೋದಮೇಲೆ ಯಾರನ್ನು ಕೇಳುವುದು?

Point of orderನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೂ ಅರ್ಥವಿಲ್ಲ. point of order ಅಲ್ಲವೇ ಅಲ್ಲ. There is no point of order. Sri Duggappa may please go to his seat.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—ನಿಮ್ಮ ರೂಲಿಂಗನ್ನು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರೇ ಜನರಲ್‌ರೂಲ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಟ್ರೆಜರಿ ಬೆಂಚಿನ ಕಡೆಯವರು ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾವು ನಿಮಗೆ ಗೌರವ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ನಾಮಿನೇಷನ್ನಿಗೂ, ಎಲೆಕ್ಷನ್ನಿಗೂ ಅಂತರವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದರೆ ಅಂಥ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡುವುದು?

ಪೋಲಿಸಿನವರು ಇಂತಿಂಥ ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹುಡುಗರನ್ನು ಚಚ್ಚಿ, ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಫೈರ್ ಓಪನ್ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಮೊದಲು ಎಚ್ಚರಿಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಆಮೇಲೆ ಫೈರ್ ಓಪನ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇಂತಿಂಥ ಜಾಗಗಳು ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಲಾಯಕ್ಕಿಲ್ಲ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದರೆ ಅಪಾಯವಿದೆ, ಮುಂತಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿ ಆಮೇಲೆ ಕಾನೂನುರೀತ್ಯ ಮೇಲಕ್ಕೆ ಫೈರ್ ಮಾಡಿ—ಈ ಕ್ರಮಗಳೂ ಫೈರ್ ಆದರೆ ಜನಗಳ

ಮೇಲೆ ನೇರವಾಗಿ ಫೈರ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದೂ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಟಿಯರ್‌ಗ್ಯಾಸ್ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಫೈರಿಂಗ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಮುನ್ನೆಚ್ಚರಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆಯೇ ನೇರವಾಗಿ ಫೈರ್‌ಮಾಡಿದರು. That amounts to murder. ಫೈರ್ ಮಾಡಿದವರಿಗೆ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ 302ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕೊಲೆಗೆ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆಯಾಗಬೇಕು. ಕಾನೂನು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಫೈರಿಂಗ್‌ಗೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಏನೇನು ಅನೌನ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಅನೌನ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡದೆ ಬೇರೆ ಮೆಥೆಡ್ಡುಗಳನ್ನು ಯೂಸ್ ಮಾಡದೆ ಹಸುಮಕ್ಕಳುಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಗುಂಡುಹಾರಿಸಿದರು. ಫೈರ್‌ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಜುಡಿಷಿಯಲ್ ಎನ್‌ಕ್ವಯಿರಿ ಮಾಡಿಸಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಈ ತನಕ enquiry ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂಥ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಗೆ ನಂಬಿಕೆ ಇಡುವುದು?

ಈಚೆಗೆ ಹುಬ್ಬಳ್ಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದುದು ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ನಡೆಯಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಹ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಕಫ್ಸ್ ಹಾಕಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ಮನುಷ್ಯನನ್ನು ಬೀದಿಬೀದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎಳೆದುಕೊಂಡು ತಿರುಗಾಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಯಾವ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ನಡೆಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಒಂದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೀಗೆ ಆಗಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಮೊಘಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಹುಬ್ಬಳ್ಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್‌ದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಲಿಸಬಹುದು. ಪ್ರಪಂಚದ ಯಾವ ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ನಡಿಯದ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಒಂದು ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಟೆನ್ಸ್ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪೋಲಿಸು ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿನವರು ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಇವರು ನಡೆಸಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಒಂದು ದಾಕ್ಷಿಣ್ಯ ಇನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ನಡೆಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೆಲವು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಯಾರು Home portfolio ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರೋ ಅವರು ಅದನ್ನು ಬೇರೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಈ portfolio ಕೆಲಸ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇದೊಂದು ನಿದರ್ಶನ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೇ ಸಾಕು. ಈ ಒಂದು ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಟೆನ್ಸ್ ಪೋಲೀಸು ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂದು ತೋರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕು. ಈ portfolio ದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಫೇಲ್ ಆಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮಗೆ ನಂಬಿಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಹತ್ತು ಘಂಟೆಗೆ ಒಂದು ನಿಮಿಷವಿದೆ. ಲಂಚ್ ಅವರ್ ಆದಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House now rise and will meet after half-an-hour.

The House adjorned for recess at ten of the Clock and reassembled at Fifty Minutes past ten of the Clock.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.— ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಹುಬ್ಬಳ್ಳಿ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಮತ್ತು ಮೈಸೂರು ನಗರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದಂಥ ಗೋಲೀಬಾರ್ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಯಾಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ, ಆ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯಾಗದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ we lost faith in this Government and so, we have moved this Motion of no confidence.

ಪ್ರೊಬೇಷನರುಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವಾಗ ಬಹಳ ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ನಡೆದಿದೆ. In the appointment of probationers, only the relatives of Ministers and the relatives of the high officials of the Party are considerd and so, we have no confidence in the Ministry.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಡಿ. ಜತ್ತಿ.— ಯಾವ ಪ್ರೊಬೇಷನರುಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವಾಗ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—When it is said that probationers are being taken on party considerations, I would like to know whether probationers means Tahsildars, or Assistant Commissioners or Deputy Commissioners or Industrial Officers.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA.--In the appointment of all the probationers.

Coming to elections to the Local Board, both the parties declared long back that we should not participate in the local board elections. ಆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಎರಡು ಪಕ್ಷಗಳೂ ಪಾರ್ಟಿ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಗ್ರಾಮಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳು ಮುಗಿಯುವವರೆಗೂ ಸ್ಪರ್ಧಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳು ಬಂದಾಗ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಬೆಳವಣಿಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಆಧಾರದಮೇಲೆ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸ್ಪರ್ಧಿಸಿ ಕೊನೆಗೆ ಅವರ ಪಕ್ಷಪಾತದ ಚುನಾವಣೆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಬಹುಮತವನ್ನುಗಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆಡಳಿತ ಯಂತ್ರವನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡರು. Therefore, we have lost faith in this Government. About 52 per cent of the voters have voted for the opposition and so, the majority have lost faith in this Government.

ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ, ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಖರ್ಚಾದುದಕ್ಕೆ ಲೆಕ್ಕ ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಬಂದಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ವೈಸ್ ಛಾನ್ಸಲರ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಹಿಂದಿನಿಂದ ಏನೊಂದು ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವಿತ್ತೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ವೈಸ್‌ಛಾನ್ಸಲರ ನೇಮಕದ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಛಾನ್ಸಲರಿಗೆ ಸಲಹೆಮಾಡಿ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿಸಿತು. ವಿಶ್ವ ವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರೂ ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯವನ್ನು ಆ ದರ್ಜೆಗೂ ಇಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯ ಸ್ವಾಧಿಕಾರ ಪಡೆದ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ (autonomous body). ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಛಾನ್ಸಲರ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ವೈಸ್‌ಛಾನ್ಸಲರೇ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿರುವಾಗ, ಈ ನೇಮಕಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣರಾಗಿರುವ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ನಂಬಿಕೆ ಇಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ! ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಂಬಿಕೆಯಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಡಿ. ಜತ್ತಿ.—ವೈಸ್‌ಛಾನ್ಸಲರ ನೇಮಕದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಸಲಹೆಯೇನು ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಅನೇಕ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಗಣ್ಯರು, ದಕ್ಷರು, ಶಕ್ತರು ಅಂಥವರು ಯಾರು ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆಯೋ ಅಂಥವರನ್ನು ವೈಸ್ ಛಾನ್ಸಲರ್ ಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ನೇಮಕಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಿದರ್ಶನ ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಶ್ರೀ ನರೇಂದ್ರ ದೇವ್‌ರವರ ನೇಮಕ. ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ವಿಧಾನಪರಿಷತ್ತಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದನಾಯಕರಾದ ಡಾಕ್ಟರ್ ಎ. ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಮೊದಲಿಯಾರರು ಈಗೊತ್ತು ವೈಸ್ ಛಾನ್ಸಲರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಮೋಟಾರ್ ವೆಹಿಕಲ್ಸ್ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಲಂಚ ನಿರೋಧ ಶಾಖೆಯವರನ್ನೂ ತುಳಿದು ಹಾಕಿ ಅವರು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಏನಿತ್ತೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಅಡ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ involve ಆಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಮಾಡದೆ ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ನಿಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ನಮಗೆ ನಂಬಿಕೆ ಹೋಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಕೊನೆಯದಾಗಿ, ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದ ವಿಸ್ತರಣೆ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದ ವಿಸ್ತರಣೆಯಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಹಣವನ್ನೂ ಎಂದರೆ ದೇಶದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಹೋಗಲಾಡಿಸಲು ಒಂದು ರಾಜಿ ಒಪ್ಪಂದಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಲು ಹೊರಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ನೀವು ರಾಜಿ ಆಗಬೇಡಿ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಪಕ್ಷವಾದರೂ ದಿನವಹಿ ಜಗಳವಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರಿಂದ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ, ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಏನೇನೂ ಸಾಧಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

ನಾವು ಒಂದಾಗಿರುವುದು ನಮಗೆ ಮಹದಾನಂದವಾಗಿದೆ. ನಮಗೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಅಸಮಾಧಾನವಿಲ್ಲ. ನೀವು ಒಂದಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯಮನುಷ್ಯ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ತೆರಿಗೆಗಳಿಂದ, ಬಡ ಬೋರೇಗೌಡನ ಖರ್ಚಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಬಳಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದ ವಿಸ್ತರಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲವನ್ನು ವಿಸ್ತರಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ನಿಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಗಿರುವ ಖಾತೆಗಳ ಹೊರೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದೇನಾದರೂ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದರಂತೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಳವನ್ನು ವಿಸ್ತರಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಡಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈಗಿರುವುದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಇಷ್ಟು ಖಾತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೂ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ, ಈಗಿರುವ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೇ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಕೆಲಸವಿಲ್ಲದೇಯಿರುವಾಗ, ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿನ ಒಡಕನ್ನು ಸರಿಮಾಡಿ, ಒಂದುಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಕೆಲಸವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಯುವ್ವರೂ ಕೂಡ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಜನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ನೀವು ದುರುಪಯೋಗ ಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದೀರೆಂದು ನಾವು ನಿಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ನಂಬಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಕಳೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

ಕಡೆಯದಾಗಿ ತಮ್ಮೆಲ್ಲರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ನಮಗೆ ನಂಬಿಕೆಯಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಅನುಮೋದಿಸಿ ನನ್ನ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

11 A.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri S. D. Kothawale.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA.—You must allow another Member of the Opposition to second this Motion just as you allowed a Member to second Sri Narasimha Reddy's Motion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There are specific provisions so far as the Motion of Thanks is concerned. That is the only Motion which requires seconding. So far as other motions are concerned, they do not require seconding.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—At least amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER.—This is a statutory Motion which requires no amendment.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I stand to oppose very definitely the vote of no confidence motion. The Leader of the Opposition who moved the no confidence motion has moved it on the eve of the coming general elections and if I say that it is meant to be an election stunt... I would not be incorrect.

(Interruptions).

Mr. SPEAKER.—Just as the Opposition Members have a right to say that this Ministry has no confidence, the party in power have a right to say that it is a stunt. There is nothing wrong in that.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—ಪಿ.ಎಸ್.ಪಿ. ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯ ಧೋರ್ಮನ್ನರ ವಿಚಾರ ಏಕೆ ಎತ್ತಬೇಕು? ಆಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷವನ್ನು ಎದುರಿಸುವ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಪಿ.ಎಸ್.ಪಿ. ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕಿದೆ. ಯಾವ ಯಾವುದನ್ನೋ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೆಲೆ ಇರುತ್ತದೆಯೇ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Every Member has a full right to say what he feels. Of course, the Opposition Members may or may not like it. Congress Members may or may not like what the Opposition Members feel; but the right cannot in any way be curtailed.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—Mr. Speaker, I request the Honourable Members opposite not to unnecessarily create any obstruction. I can understand intelligent obstruction but let them know that they should be prepared to take if they want to give us also. The point is this: The election stunt has been brought in with a view to creating an opinion against the Congress party; but I am sure that the Honourable Members of this House and the public outside are not going to be influenced. This matter has been demonstrated times without number. The opposition parties have been defeated and defeated in a very substantial measure from time to time and therefore such a propaganda is going to be of no avail to the opposition. It is up to us to utilise the time of the House in a proper and constructive way in the service of the people.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I rise to a point of order. Under the rules of procedure of this House, every Member has got a right. He is curtailing the right of a Member...

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let him kindly take his seat. The Hon'ble Member has no right to curtail anybody's right. If it is the submission of the Hon'ble Member, Sri Muckannappa, that the Hon'ble Member Sri Kothawale is curtailing the right of any Member, I will look to it. I will never allow the curtailment of any Member's right. Let us follow what he says. There will be an opportunity for him to reply.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—The first point raised by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was regarding the efficiency in administration. Here I think beyond making certain vague allegations that the administration is deficient, no particulars are given.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIAH.—I did not make any vague allegations.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He has a right to say what he feels.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—I listened to the Leader of the Opposition very patiently; so also, he should have patience to listen to me. I submit that it is very difficult to reply to the point unless instances are given. I want to make one specific point. For the efficiency of the administration, the co-operation of the Opposition Members also is greatly necessary. Some times generally vituperative and abusive language is used by the Opposition; things are repeated times out of number, and out of context and we are made to hear the same thing again and again every year about the matters coming for consideration before this House. (Interruption from Sri C. J. Muckannappa).

Mr. SPEAKER.—If this is the way, we will not be proceeding at all.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—The same arguments, the same things almost in the same language are repeated in respect of all motions that come before this House. My submission in this connection is that this House has registered its votes and rejected all the pleas raised by the Opposition so far and therefore, I think they are stopped morally and also legally to raise the same issues. The point is that the pleas

having been rejected, it is no longer necessary and no useful purpose is going to be served by hearing the repetitions of those pleas, again on the floor of the House. I like to make a reference to the role of opposition. I can understand the desirability of the opposition if it is constructive. Without opposition, no democracy can function. But what is needed is constructive opposition. Opposition does not mean opposition for its own sake and the use of abusive language, vituperative language, reckless and irresponsible criticism. What we are seeing here is everything but responsible and constructive opposition. If the opposition wants to play an effective role and a correct role in the functioning of democracy, I request them to be more responsive, to be more constructive and to such a constructive effort I for one shall bow my head down to them. But the point is, we want constructive opposition. If they, by their own talks, by their own conduct and by their own deeds make it difficult for the Government to run the Administration efficiently, then, they are also responsible for the inefficiency if any.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Is it all definite and specific reply to the points raised, Sir ?

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—Unfortunately, the Leader of Opposition has made vague allegations and it is not possible to meet them specifically.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA.—You appoint a Judge of the High Court and we will prove it. Will you kindly advise the Ministry to appoint a High Court Judge ? We will prove everything.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—Sir, I request the Members of the Opposition here and now to be more constructive. Let them criticise and point out the mistakes in the administration and make alternative suggestions. But, merely opposing a thing for the sake of opposition does not serve anybody's purpose. (Hear, hear—*from Treasury Benches*).

The next point that was raised by the Hon'ble Leader of Opposition is about inadequate representation to opposition Members in the different committees constituted by Government. Sir, I could not follow the argument of my friend. The correct way of doing things is that there should be no political consideration or party consideration in the constitution of committees; but only the suitability of the persons should be considered. Whether he is a Congress man or P. S. P. man, it does not matter.

Sir, the suitability of the person for the post for which he is appointed counts for more. Therefore, absolutely no reason is brought to show that appointments are made on any other ground than those mentioned by me. Sir, allegations can be easily made but they should have some reasonableness. It is not right to say that no representation is given to the opposition party. Wherever Government have thought that there are suitable persons, they have been appointed.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA.—Don't you find a single suitable person from this side?

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—Will the Leader of the Opposition have patience? He said that 90 per cent of the Members in the Committees belong to the ruling party. He should have given instances. Sir, there are Members of the opposition also in the Committees. The question is, whether the proportion is adequte or inadequate.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA.—Is there a single Member from this side in the Khadi Board, Sir?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಆ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ನೀವು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಗಲಾಟೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ನೀವು ಏನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರೋ ಅದನ್ನು ನೀವು ಮಾತನಾಡುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರೂ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಕೊತವಳಿಯವರು ಈಗ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. He is not the last speaker. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವವರು ಬಹಳ ಮಂದಿ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ನೀವು ಶಾಂತಿಯಿಂದ ಕೇಳಿ. ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಗೊಂದಲಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾರೂ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಡಿ.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—That, we will do, when the Speaker is not able to control them.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I rise to a point of order. Is it open to an Hon'ble Member of this House to make an accusation against the Speaker that he cannot control the Members of this House? That is a definite allegation and you must take notice of it.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I am sorry; Sri Mallaradhya is putting something which I have not said.

(At this stage the Official Reporter was asked to read the remarks made by Sri K. Puttaswamy and it was read)

Mr. SPEAKER.—What the Hon'ble Member has said is that if it goes out of my control, the other side also wants to do it. So, it does not mean all that. Supposing the House goes out of control; then, the same thing is done from the other side. You must allow the Member to speak; then, everything will go right. If you do like this at every stage, proceedings cannot go on smoothly. If you want the debate on this important issue to progress in a proper way, you should bear with me and allow every Member to have his say.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I want the Reporter's Note to be read again. It is the property of the House.

(The remarks of Sri Puttaswamy were read again.)

Mr. SPEAKER.—It says, 'that, we will do when the Speaker is not able to control them" It does not mean that the Speaker is not capable of controlling.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—I would request the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition not to create unnecessary difficulties in the way of the progress of the debate.

I was saying that the Leader of the Opposition had made a complaint that the Opposition is not adequately represented in the various Committees constituted by Government. I would only say that those Members of the Opposition who were qualified in the opinion of the Government to serve the purposes and objectives of the committees were duly appointed. Such nominations were decided purely on merits and nothing to the contrary has been shown by the Leader of the Opposition. As an instance, I will point out that Sri Mallaradhya is the Chairman of the Pre-Primary Education Enquiry Committee......

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—It is not this Government which appointed me......

Sri G. DUGGAPPA.—It is a Congress Ministry which appointed him as Chairman.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA —Sir, by way of personal explanation I should say that my appointment as Chairman of the Pre-Primary Enquiry Committee is not due to the courtesy of the present Ministry but it is due to the wisdom of the previous Ministry.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—The Congress Government is continuous. The Hon'ble Member connot split it into two parts according to convenience.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The no-confidence is against the present Ministry and not the previous one.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—But why should the Member take it seriously. The previous Government was also a Congress Government.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—Not only that. My friend Sri Mallaradhya is a Member of various committees constituted by the State Government. So also my learned friend Sri Ramappa is the Chairman of the delegated Legislation committee and my friend Sri Arumugham is a Member of several Committees of Lagislature as well as those constituted by the Government.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟೇಜ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೋ, ಅಷ್ಟು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮಗೆ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ರೈಟ್ ಇಲ್ಲ.

(Interruptions)

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Regarding Sri Ramappa's appointment as Chairman, it was done by the Hon'ble Speaker and not at the behest of the Congress Ministry.

(Interruptions.—The Speaker called the House to order several times)

Mr. SPEAKER.—I request Sri Kothawale that when he quotes instances, he quotes them properly because it is possible that I may be dragged in the affair. Actually, I made Sri Ramappa the Chairman of a Committee.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—I have no desire to bring the Chair into this controversy.

Now, it is admitted, and the protestations made by Ho 'ble Members show that there is representation, but according to them, it is inadequate. I would only point out that Members are appointed on some sound principles and not with a view to give representation to this or that party. In making nominations to administrative or executive bodies, the suitability, capacity and the confidence reposed in an individual are deciding factors and not the fact that he belongs to this or that party. Therefore, the charge is not only vague but untenable.

Another point raised by the leader of the Opposition is that the problem of unemployment and underemployment has not been properly tackled. Hon'ble Members know how we are living in a planned economy. In spite of the best efforts made by the Central and State Governments, we have not been able to keep pace with the growing unemployment. But I do feel that what all that could be done has been done. The plans have been placed before Parliament and this Legislature. They have been properly discussed and passed and are being implemented. In spite of this, it lies ill in the mouths of the Opposition to say that the Government has not done its best to meet the problem arising out of unemployment and underemployment. Population has been growing and my friend Sri Mallaradhya sometimes waxed eloquent that we should practise family planning......

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—By way of personal explanation, I never advocated family planning, I have never, never in my life, not even now (*laughter*).

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—I remember Sri Mallaradhya saying that.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—My views on this matter have been published by the Government of India in an authorised document, that is, the Census Commissioner's report.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—I am referring to his views only. In any case, this phenomenal growth in population is one reason why we are lagging behind, the pace of the population growth. These are matters which we ought to consider coolly and in an atmosphere of constructive co-operation of all sections. Moving a motion of no confidence is hardly the way to solve this problem. The financial targets enunciated in the plans have been substantially fulfilled. Hon'ble Members may know that the second plan amount for the State was 145 crores and this amount was subsequently reduced. We have been able to spend 96 to 97 per cent of the entire amount, a performance of which we should be very very proud. Therefore, the criticism in this respect is absolutely without any basis.

Another charge levelled is that in the matter of starting industries, outsiders are helped and the local elements are not encouraged. I fail to understand the correctness of this plea. As a matter of fact, I know

that before the West Coast Mill was started, attempts were made by the leaders of Karnatak to persuade local enterpreneurs to take up the industry but there was no response and ultimately this had to bo given to an outside man. I wish specific instances had been furnished. I do not know if the Opposition means that the Chief Minister is interested in some outsiders at the cost of local interests. The charge is prepostrous and is totally unacceptable. Such an allegation connot be sustained at all.

The Leader of the Opposition said that some discrimination has been shown in the matter of Registration of societies. Is it that the Leader of the Opposition sent certain proposals to the Assistant Registrar of Societies for Registration and that were not accepted.

11-30. A.M.

No such instances have been cited. It is open to anybody to organise a co-operative society and get it registered. Nobody comes in the way of any such move. That happened in Kerala under the Communist rule and not here. Let the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition underestand this position.

As regards, nominations, he made reference to certain person whose name was not mentioned. If it is the same person whom I have in mind, I should readily say that he is a person who has done yeomen services in the co-operative field and if he is nominated, it is because of his undoubted capacities for making very valuable contributions to the co-operative cause. It is further said Sir, that he was dealing in piece-goods. The society was not dealing in piece goods.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA.—It is dealing in piece-goods.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—That position is doubted and disputed.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA.—When I say something on the floor of the House, I say it with all responsibility. Why should you doubt? I will prove that the present society is dealing with piece goods.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—Another allegation made was that a person who failed in the election was appointed.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA.—Elections in the same co-operative society.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—Sir, I understand that if a person has failed in elections to the Assembly and the Council, he should not be brought into the House by back-door.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA.—He was defeated in the field of co-operative field in the same society. That same gentleman is brought into the society again by nomination.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—As regards references to Sharavathi Sir, I was astounded to hear the remarks. I might make a reference here to what the Hon'ble Member, Sri Veerappa had to say on the occasion of our inespections visit to Sharavathi. I quite remember he was waxing eloquent about the achievement there and we had heard his one hour oration that day about the execution and efficiency displayed there. I really do not know when the PSP charged its views on Sharavathi.

Sri C. K. RAJIAH SETTY.—Just because one Member appreciated the work done at the project site, do you mean to say that no fraud took place?

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—I think the Hon'ble P. W. Minister should be complimented for the expeditiousness with which the work has been done there.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Then why was his portfolio snatched away Sir?

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—Work has got to proceed apace with great speed and expeditiousness. Quick decisions are necessary and sometimes rules should not be allowed to stand in the way of quick execucsion of work,in view of the strata and weather conditions at Sharavati. Therefore, it ill lies in the mouth of my learned friend who made the allegation without the facts and figures. The position has been fully explained times out of number and the House has accepted that explation. In these circumstances, to condemn the Government on this score is something which I cannot understand.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member time is up. Let him close.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—Sir, reference has been made to interference in the judiciary. In the matter of appointment of High Court Judges, there is a certain set procedure. The Opinion of the Government, the opinion of the Chief Justice of the Court and the recommendation of the Chief Justice of India are all taken into considerations and President makes the appointment. I do not know how there could be any interference by the State Government in a matter of this kind. How interference could come into the picture at all, I am not able to understand. It really shows lack of appreciation on the part of the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition to make such remarks.

Even there, I fail to understand what type of interference is alleged. Nobody is there to allow intereference. One can judge by the number of the writ petitions that are filed in the High Court and people getting their redress in the High Court. It is not possible for anybody to interfere with the High Court or the judiciary, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He should kindly finish. I want to give chance to seven more Members.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—I will take only two minutes, Sir. The reference was made to the Youth Festival and law and order and security

in that connection. I am inclined to thank the Hon'ble Member, Sri J. B. Mallaradhya who was associated with the organisation of the Youth Festival. He issued a statement commending the exemplary conduct of the police and thanking them for the restraint with which they had conducted themselves. It now ill lies in the mouth of the Leader of the Opposition to say that the police did not behave properly in this connection. I think the matter is still fresh in our memory. One should not forget facts so easily.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The Congress Committee passed a resolution at Hubli, Sir.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—I have taken much time and I must close. Of course, I close my speech by requesting that the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition should withdraw in a sporting spirit his no-confidence motion.

Mr. SPEAKER,—Sri Shamsunder

(Sri C. J. MUCKKANNAPPA.—*rose.*)

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will take very serious notice of his conduct. He is disturbing the proceedings.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Is not interruption in the debate allowed, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not merely interruption. I him that he should behave better.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—If I have done anything wrong against the Chair, I am prepared to quit. Please tell me Sir, if I have acted against the wishes of the Chair?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Record of the proceedings shows that he has misused his privilege.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—If the chair has any issues, it can ask me to go out.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I ask him to withdraw from the House, Please.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Very Good, these things will not continue any longer.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He should please withdraw from the House.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—When you ask me to withdraw, I am prepared to withdraw. Let the chair not bother. It is a reflection not on me.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We will look to the reflection afterwards. It is not against me, it is against the House. He cannot argue with me. He should please withdraw. He should go out, he should kindly withdraw.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I am going out.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I see that this is too serious a conduct, and I think the whole House should take notice of this, too serious a conduct. After all, I have the authority of the House. If the House has given me any authoraity, I do not act at all. It is too serious a matter, to argue with the Chair, one must be very confident of the stand that one takes. One cannot argue with the Chair and every time go on disturbing the proceedings. Members can interrupt here and there. But disturbance is not interruption. It is too much.

† Sri B. SHAMSUNDER (Bhalki).—Mr. Speaker Sir, just now we heard a beautiful speech from an Hon'ble Member who belongs to some complimentary society (*laughter*). Now whether he has complimented himself and his party is known to the entire country. There is a verse in urdu and these are important charges.

> "From where I can get a person like you? If you want, I will give you a mirror in your hand to see your face."

Now, Sir, 29 charges were framed not by us. If you have got any conscience, please do not speak. If you have any sense of honour, please do not talk. Why all this farce? You have kept the entire country in suspense. You created hatred against each other. You have practised--what word shall I use-there is no word for such things. There is no word at all. You have done all this. You have made the people believe that you are the most honest people in this World-an Avatar of Satya Harischandra.

It is as though they are Avatars of Satya and Harischandra.

Now I will quote another couplet.

Sri A. R. PANCHAGAVI.—I rise to a point of order. Can an Hon'ble Member recite poetry here?

Mr. SPEAKER.—A Member can recite a couplet, but he cannot sing in this House.

Sri B. SHAMSUNDER.—I am not singing. Anything which we say to them, even bad words, they take as fun or song. What a wonderful people are they! Everthing is sweet song to them.

The meaning of the couplet is that when brutes come to terms, it is bad for others.

Why should I try to bring more charges? They have already got their own charges. You take the 29 charges of your own party and answer them one by one, word by word. That is our allegation. If you want some more allegations, there are--I did not have time. I did not know that this no confidence motion would come up. Otherwise I would have brought with me my big file containing several charges against them. So I shall now give only a few instances. The first charge is about discrimination. It is a very serious charge. I had

also asked a question about this. Our Constitution says that you should not discriminate between person and person in any manner. I had asked a question to the Chief Minister during the last Session: "Is it a fact that only Harijans are made to scavenge in the jails and prisons?" This is a very serious matter. The entire World looks upon you with contempt. To this question the Chief Minister replied in a very unsatisfactory manner. Only a few days ago in the United Nations when Sri Jha was presiding as Chairman of the Human Relations Commission this question was put and your Government was unable to reply. They were not prepared to discuss this point. This is an International scandal against you, but this Ministry has not taken any note of it.

To quote another charge, in the first Session of this House the Finance Minister Sri T. Mariappa made a remark. He is a very nice man. I shall quote only one sentence from his remark. He said that :"Emotional and psychological integration should take place". All right. But I will give you one example of how you are working to bring about this integration and how you are treating the people who have come here from the integrated areas. I can give the file number also. This is the file regarding people who have come down from the integrated areas, No. AF. 55 GES 58. In the words of the Cabinet itself the "people who have come from the integrated areas should not be given any promotion." That is how you have been treating the people from the integrated areas. This sentence has been initialled by Sri N. Rachaiah on 16th September 1959 followed by Sri T. Mariappa and also the Chief Minister. All these Ministers have signed it. This is how you have been treating the people from the integrated areas. Is this the way to get the co-operation of the integrated people. You pass your own orders against them. Then the Chief Minister writes below: "In view of the discussion in the Cabinet I have already written a letter to the Government of India. For the present I agree." Thr Minister for Financ being an intelligent man, writes: "We need not take up this matter. He is a financial export. He has been in the Cabinet continuously for years' due to his financial skill and so in this case he has cleverly escaped without committing himself in any way.

There are several other charges which I need not enumerate here. The firts charge that I have mentioned is about discrimination. Who are the people whom you have put down for scavenging work? Is this not discrimination against the Constitution? Let them answer this.

The next point it about secularism. Are we secular? I am a person who does not believe in religion. I have no faith in what you call God. I shall give some examples to show how far you are secular and how far you have been following the Constitution for which you have taken the oath. About two years ago our Chief Minister had been to my constituency, Bidar. There a lot of Muslims came and made some complaints to him and gave him written memoranda also

(Sri B. SHAMSUNDER)

about mosques and musjids. I have got a lengthy list of those mosques and musjids. I have also got all the memoranda which they submitted to him because copies were sent to me also. They have said in that all those mosques and musjids are in the possession of non-Muslims. When this fact was brought to your notice, what steps have you taken? How far are you going to protect the interest of the minorities? It is due to your neglience that you had to divide India? Even now it is a question how far you are taking interest and how far you are neglecting your own State and how far you are secular in your deeds. To quote only one such mosque. I may mention the mosque at Shahabad. I had been there. A lady Member of this Assembly whose father-in-law is a very influential person also comes from there. That gentleman has been my friend since 30 years. He is in Parliament now. He also had been there. Those people were canvassing for votes when I went there. I told the people. "You vote for the Congress people provided they restore the mosque at Shahabad." They have not yet restored it till now. Then the mosque at Rakeli taluk in Bidar has been smashed.

Another at Bagi. About that I even represented to Pandit Nehru. This is your discrimination. These are the points you have to answert Not only this; therc are others also, a number of them. Only eigh. or ten days back I wrote a letter to the Chief Minister stating that one of his Ministers who came to Gulburga on an official tour, threatened the Muslims and other minorities, at a public meeting. These are the words: "If you don't join the Congress you will reep the consequences." Yesterday, he said 'No, no, I did not say that." Let him issue a statement to that effect, but the impression created in the minds of those people there was different. Yesterday when I was talking about it with my friend Sri Dhanappa, he himself said "The Minister said the same thing when he came to my place." This is a very serious thing. Some kind of bad propaganda is going on. There are some instances. There is a list. I will give this list. I brought this to the notice of the Chief Minister. He has no courtecy even to acknowledge that letter. On the lands given to Harijans crops have come up. In the presence of the Tahsildars and the Assistant Commissioner, the lands belonging to Harijans were grazed. Two or three acres of land are given to a Harijans. All these applications have been forwarded. I am going to give this list also.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—I would like to know whether is it proper for an Hon'ble Member to refer to any confidentsal paper; because one does not know whether it is on authorised copy. The Hon'ble Member says 'This is the letter which I have got in my hand and I am reading it." I am appealing to the Chair to give a ruling as to whether coufidential papers can be brought in this manner in the House because all the papers are there; whether it is to be disclosed or not, various

aspects will arise. Also, one does not know whether it is an authorised copy or a spurious copy. I was under the imppression that the letter read is a certified copy ; but I find that it is not like that ; so that if the next letter is also of the same nature, the Chair may consider whether such a proceedure may be permitted.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.— I think it is perfectly within the legitimate right of an Hon'ble Member to invite reference to a particular order passed by Government, unless the Members of the Treasury Benches prove that it is a spurious document. The Hon'ble Member Sri Shamsunder is now referring to the contents of a paiticular file in which the Chief Minister and several Ministers appeared to have made a note. The substance of the noting has been referred to and he is saying that all these are copies of the documents which he has submitted to the Chief Minister in his capacity as an Hon'ble Member of this House. What is the objection taken to? Is there any matter in which Sri Shamsunder has violated the rules of proceedure regulating the conduct of the House.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sri Baliga has been asleep till now. He should have raised it earlier when the other papers were read. Now objection is raised with reference to the next paper which Sri Shamsunder is going to refer to. Only after the paper is read, then only objection can be taken.

Sri C. K. RAJIAH SETTY.—My friend quoted only the numer and stated the contents. Just because you deserve to have a copy, he gave it to you. After all, he quoted the number and it is for the Minister to ascertain whether it is correct or not.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—The position is like this. When an Hon'ble Member has got a piece of paper in his hand and says that "this is what I am reading " unless we know that it is not an original, are we to anticipate that it is not an original, that it is a certified copy of the original and what is the original and all that? I think the Member knows his responsibility so far as such things are concerned. The paper that I saw purports to be a purely confidential matter which has been circulated amongst the Ministers and I am perfetly right in saying that the Government will be entitled to say and perhaps right in saying that this is a confidential paper which cannot be disclosed. If somebody manages to get copy of such a paper and does not say that it is such a paper but merely says he has got something from the Government and he is reading it, are we to anticipate something ? My friend Sri M. C. Narasimhan said that I agreed to what has happened. I want to prevent such a thing happening so far as the second thing is concerned, that the next paper also should be read like that. This is of a serious nature and this position is to be expunged.

12-NOON

I want to prevent that kind of a situation arising so that if the second paper is of the same type, I appeal to the Speaker to satisfy himself

(Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA)

that it is a true authorised copy of the paper which cannot be disclosed. Can this go in the proceedings? I am appealing to the Chair to ascertain and prevent such a thing happening for a second time.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I have all the appreciation to the newly appointed Minister, Sri R. V. Baliga. I have got great respect for his legal acumen. But, in this case he has miserably failed. It is open to them to take action against any Member if he has got the possession of a spurious document; nothing prevents them from doing so. But, nobody can prevent my friend Mr. Shamsunder from reading the contents of an official document and bring home to the Hon'ble Speaker and the House that the Ministry has failed to do justice to the country. The point is, even before my friend Sri Shamsunder has read the contents of the second document, the Minister anticipates something very serious. In their anxiety to prevent revealing of the failures and misdeeds of the Government, why does he want to raise a legal point.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Of course, it is a little bit of a ticklish point. So far as Government orders are concerned, the question does not arise at all because they are all public documents and everybody is entitled to refer to them.

A document which purports to be a confidential document so far as Government is concerned and in case it falls into the hands of the Oppsition or a private Member, what should be done. Is he entitled to make use of that co fidential document or not? In my opinion, I think, in such a case, the member has a right to make use of it. I am not here to plead anythi g; I am here to give my ruling according to my conscience. There are occasions where the confidential documents of the Government have fallen into the hands of other Member and they make use of it. The Treasury Benches may rebut that it is furious and what the Member has produced is not a real document at all; they can say all that. But, to say that the Member cannot use the document which the Government considers to be confidential, does not hold much water. At the same time, it is a very serious matter and it is open to the Government to investigate; it is not for me. At present, I am only concerned with a document which has been referred to by my friend Sri Shamsunder. It is a matter which seems to be a correspondence between the Ministers. I read the document and I showed it to the Chief Minister and the law Minister. They have ample opportunity to rebut it. But, once a document is referred to by a Member, I have to look into it and the whole House has a right to look into it; that cannot be denied.

In these circumstances, I feel that the only way is to verify the facts by the Government instead of taking objection. The facts may on may not be correct. Who knows? It may be a spurious document.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—May I know the ruling of the Chair, that it purports to be a original document which has fallen in the hands

of somebody as against that a copy which purports to be a copy of the original? Then, can it be said that it can be used in the House?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The pointat present is, that Sri Shamsunder referred to certain facts He says it is a copy. The point is, whether he is entitled to refer to a document which is of a confidential nature from the Government's view point. It is open to the Government and they have ample opportunity to look into the matter and rebut the whole thing.

Even apart from producing a copy of the document, he can refer to some facts contained in the confidential document. He can refer and the Government can rebut it. At the same time, when the Member makes certain allegations on the basis of that copy of the confidential document, it is for me and to the whole House to know what it is. In fact, I have read it and it is not so much of a serious matter.

Sri B. SHAMSUNDER.—Sir, I had some time for breathing. *(Laughter)*

Sir, I know a case and I think the Hon'ble Speaker and the Law Minister also know the case and that is the case about Mr. Benamin, one of the finest writers. A case like, about confid ential papers, was conducted in the Bombay High Court and it was decided that everybody is entitled to produce such document.

Now, Sir, you are aware that a Chief Minister of the Congress had ordered to inscribe in the front of this buliding "Sarkarada kelasa Devara kelasa" (Government's work is God's work). Another Ministry of the same Congress erased it. But the inscription on the North wing of the building still remains, namely "Satyameva Jayathe"

This Ministry retains this on the gate. These are the inconsistencies in the Government. I have no particular pleasure in accusing those in power. There is a saying in Urdu which means that one word is enough for a respectable man. I will quote an instance, that is, the so-called land rules, of which the Government speaks so much. It is the same story as the public Service Commission selection that if no suitable Harijan candidate is available the reserved vacancy shall go to a non-Harijan. It always happens that no suitable Harijan candidate is available and the post invariably goes to a non-Harijan. In the same way under the land rules there is a provision by which if the land is less than 2 acres, it should go to a Harijan, otherwise it should be divided among others.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—The Hon'ble Member has read the rules wrongly. It is 10 acres, not 2 acres.

Sri B. SHAMSUNDER.—I have read the rule and memorised it. Unfortunately, the Revenue Minister is not here,. I will tell what happens. The Tahsildar or the Deputy Commissioner can give it outright without the permission of the higher authorities, to the Harijans. Yet even these 2 acres have not yet been distributed

(Sri B. SHAMSUNDER)

or given in their names pattas have not been given. I know that in Javergi more than 100 villages have been grazen by the cattle and the Tahsildar and the Deputy Commissioner are standing silent. In some cases, the Tahsildar stood before the fields and allowed the people to send the cattle for grazing on fields of Harijans. Large properties have been devastated. Yet nothing had been done. The administration is unable to see things. That is the difficulty. The people in the villages are small, little, innocent people. They are short-sighted. They do not know what would happen to them in the future. They are caste-ridden. I do not blame the caste Hindus. They do not like the Harijans. They do not want to live in their midst as equals. It is the folly of the Government not to have educated and enlightened the people of the villages on their duties and responsibilities towards their fellow-creatures. Government have failed in performing an essential duty. When a caste-Hindu sees a Harijan owning a field, he cannet tolerate it. He says 'This fellow was my slave till yesterday. Today he owns lands and is my equal'. What is it that the Government have done to disabuse his mind of such notions. Nothing. This has been brought to the notice of Government several times, but without result. Harijans have been turned out of their lands yet Government keeps mum. You have failed in your duty. Yet you sit here comfortably. Gladstone it is who said that "one man is majority against the entire world". The Congress majority is 150. Let them not be drunk with this idea. They have not taken the trouble to educate the masses in spite of this big majority. People do not know how to put marks on election ballot papers. Yet the Congress takes a pride of their majority. As a result the caste Hindus still hate the Harijans and would not allow them to come up. What is it that the Government have done ? You are simply sitting here, replying to our qustions—we are only 50 here. Gladstone has said that one man is majority enough for the whole world, provided he is sincere and true to his own conscience. We have brought numerous instances to the notice of the Government. Yet they sit here glibly, do nothing and go on saying that they have done their duty. You are trying to consolidate your party. The party has been placed in power to serve the people and the country and not to strengthen the party. My friend Sri Puttaramaiah has made several allegations and Sri Kothawale—somehow he has smuggled out..........

Mr. SPEAKER.—Nobody sumggled him out.

Sri B. SHAMSUNDER.—He smuggled himself out. He tried to reply. He said that men of experience, who have done their duty are choseen to serve on Commsittees. As if we in the opposition have not done our duty. According to him only those who sit in the majority party and lift their hands at the time of voting are people who have

rendered service to the country. If that is so, I have no quarrel with him.

John Adams, one of the great writers of political history says

> "We may appeal to every Page of history we have hitherto turned over, for proof irrefragable that the people when they have been unchecked, have been as unjust, tyrannical, brutal, barbarous and cruel as any King or Senate possessed of uncontrollable power: the majority has eternally and without on exception usurped over the rights of the minority".

Throughout the World, this is the case. This 150 has usurped and crushed the minority. I have a list and I will send it to the Chief Minister for verification. Another thing I brought to the attention of the Chief Minister and on which I represented is about an Assistant Commissioner.

One Asst. Commissioner, a young boy of Gulbarga, very intelligent and I do not know what phrases still more we have to use about him. I wrote a letter to the Chief Minister. I met the Chief Minister. I even called his attention in this House. That gentleman molested a lady-that gentleman manhandled a lady, that gentleman went on fields before me and I brought this to the notice of the Chief Minister. It is all a manipulation. Supposing you bring to notice some injustice, at once I will take notice of it. It is not so in party-politics. What happend? Some gentleman ran here and on the very day sent. He ran to some other world also and what happened? that fellow was not punished, and some case was cooked up and I was replied in the House that the case is *sub-judice*. I do not know what is *sub-judice*; filling a little paper there and ignoring all the facts-how can it be satisfied? I will appeal to the conscience of the Chief Minister-when I know that a thing is there, if you do not satisfy me and on the contrary, you act agianst it, how can you command respect from me? So, in the end, only one word is enough. The charges which have been brought against the Ministry stand. The Charges brought up by their own party-men there also are to be answered. When the charges come out, I think their best minds have drafted the charges. When these charges come out, it is our property. The Hon'ble Chief Minister will answer point by point these charges and my two or three charges--one is about the Asst.Commissiner, another about discrimination and the third and the last one about the Cabinet. How can you command our respect and confidence when you behave like this; you do not take our men into confidence. The Cabinet as was said just now, is one body. You have not taken our men at all. You have not taken a single Muslim. Not a single Muslim is a chairman of any committee. Leave me alone. I do not like to be on any of your committees. We have no time. We do not want it. But from your party-men, have you ever taken? The other day we saw that the Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has appointed Indira Gandhi, as chairman of some committee. Your own party-men want to know how for the minorities

(Sri B. SHAMSUNDER)

are contented with your governance. And you here disregard the commands and orders of your own High Command. I will like you to answer point by point and let me know why you have not appointed and taken one more Harijan as Cabinet Minister-a Muslim as a cabinet minister. Are we unfit? Have we not got the men? I can give you thousands and thousands of people who are able to compete with any of you in each and every respect. A day will come. The best convention is as said is always the English Conventions. The best convention would have been for you to invite your friends to come into the Cabinet. You are again and again saying that you follow the English conventions. But I find that you have not got much respect not only towards principles, but what you do is much against democracy and even against the conscience of humanity. Thank you Sir.

†Sri F. H. MOHISIN (Hubli City).—Sir, I rise here to oppose the motion of no confidence brought in by the Opposition, Of course, the intentions of the Opposition are clear. It is no more than an election stunt brought in only to win a few votes in the coming elections. In fact, I had some discussions with the Opposition Members and they were so broad minded enough to tell me clearly that they never intended to oust the Ministry or oust the Government, buts they only wanted to have a propaganda in the House for winning some votes in the next general Elections.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Who are those wonderful Members, I wish their names are made known. We can get rid of them.

Sri F. H. MOHISIN.—I do not want to expose my Hon'ble Friends.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್.ಡಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.–ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇವರಿಗೆ ನಾಚಿಕೆ ಯೆಂಬುದೇ ಇಲ್ಲ.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Is it proper to use the word 'NACHIKILLA' (ನಾಚಿಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲ). He must withdraw it.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್.ಡಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.-ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪದ ಶುದ್ಧ ಹಳಗನ್ನಡದ್ದು. ಅದರಲ್ಲೇನೂ ಅಂಥ ಅಪಾರ್ಥವಿಲ್ಲ. ಇನ್ನೂ ಅವರ ಕಡೆ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸತಕ್ಕ 'ಏನ್ರಲಾ' ಎಂಬ ಶಬ್ದವಾದರೆ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಪಾರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ...

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, Order. ಏನೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಅಂಥ ಪದವನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು.

"ನಾಚಿಕೆ" ಎಂಬ ಪದವೇನೋ It is not unparliamentary. But it is a very strong word. ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಪಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಬಳೆಸುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ಎಚ್ಚರಿಕೆಯಿಂದಿರಬೇಕು.

Sri F. H. MOHISIN.—Sir, it may not be in the interest of my friends on the Opposition to disclose their names. Their intentions are so clear and I congratulate them on giving us an opportunity to reply. Otherwise, they would have made much of them at the time of elections.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Their *bona fides* are very clear.

Sri F. H. MOHISIN.—But Now, I thank them for giving us an Opportunity to refute them on the floor of this House. I thank them for that.

12-30 P.M.

The first ground is that the Ministry have failed to tone up the administration. This is such a very elastic and vague charge that they may speak anything about administration. Without pointing out any specific instances, it is easy for anybody to criticise that the administration has not been toned up, but it is very difficult to point out some specific instances of such a nature. My friends on the other side have not been clear on this point as to bring specific instances to our notice. It is the usual habit of the opposition to criticise in this way and there is nothing unusual in their way of speeches. So it is not worthwhile considering this charge at all. We can only say that we are giving the best administration that is possible. It all depends upon how you look at it. Men with coloured glasses always look at things in a different way. We cannot help it.

The second that my friends wanted to make out is this and that I think is their real grievance. That is that many of the opposition Members are not included in the committees appointed by Government. I might say that this is a ridiculous charge. If this is the grievance of the Opposition that they should have a few seats in the various committees. I am sorry for them.

An HON'BLE MEMBER.—It is a privilege.

Sri F.H. MOHISIN.—I am only happy that they have not demanded a few seats in the Cabinet. The constitution of committees is entirely left to the Government. The Government have been gracious enough to include some of the members of the Opposition who are non-Congressmen in some of the committees. The very fact that they have mentioned that more than 90 per cent of the members of Committees are from the ruling party goes go show that some members are also from outside the ruling party. That itself is sufficient to show how broad-based our committees are. My friend the Leader of the Opposition pointed out the chairmanship of the Electricity Board. Of course, Sri Channaiah had been a Minister. He has got ample administrative capacity and he is also a member of the down-trodden community. If our friends opposite cannot tolerate the chairmanship of such a man, I do not know what kind of administration they visualise and how the administration will run in their hands. I am sure it will never come to their hands.

†Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—If my Hon'ble friend will yield I may point out that this was the subject matter of a short notice question wherein a statutory requirement for filling up this post was brought to their notice. That statutory requirement is that the incumbent should have commercial experience. At that time the Minister for Public Works and Electricity was pleased to reply that the commercial experience of that gentleman was running a flour mill. Is this the kind of commercial experience envisaged for this post? My friend Sri Mohisin was eloquent in defence of this appoint. I am only sorry for him.

Sri F. H. Mohisin.—The very fact that the Government have appointed him as Chairman goes to show that he fulfils all the requirements.

†Sri H. M. Channabasappa.—I might tell the Hon'ble Member Sri Narasimhan that at the time I pointed out that was only one of the qualifications, but that was not the only qualification laid down. There are other things which are also necessary. Taking an overall picture, the capacity and the experience of the gentleman we have appointed him. On the one hand my friend Sri Shamsunder does loud thinking in this House that Harijans are not appointed, but on the other my friend Sri Narasimhan takes us to task when we encourage Harijans? What is all this?

Sri F.H. Mohisin.-His only grievance seems to be that the chairmanship of the Electricity Board was not given to the Opposition. I would only say that they have selected the best man available. Even as regards other committees, it is for the Government to see who is best suited for its chairmanship and they have done it. We have been magnanimous enough to accommodate a few members from Opposition and it comes to more than 10%. They have even made one of the Members of the Opposition chairman of a committee.

Then, Sir, their ground No. 2 also has no substance at all.

The third point that they want to stress in this House is that the Ministry have failed to tackle the problems of unemployment and under employment. Under these five year plans we have been seeing that many projects have been taken up and they have been helping us to provide employment to thousands and lakhs of persons. So it is not proper to say that the Ministry have failed to tackle the problem of unemployment. Thousands of people have been employed. In fact, one of the difficulties of Government to take up works is to find labour for doing the work. When we visited the Sharavathi project we say that labour was brought there from Andhra Pradesh because lobour was not available to work at the Sharavathi Project. That goes to show that our State has tackled this problem. Labour is not available even if employment is available. My friends have failed to look into this fact.

In the matter of industrialisation, my friend Sri Kothavale has already answered this charge. Private enterpreneurs in the State have been given preference. In fact, Government have announced more than once that they are willing to give any help if any persons from the State come forward to start new industries. They have promised all help in the matter of raw matrieals and also loan, etc. In spite of that, if you lack in private enterprise and if nobody comes forward, then as a last alternative we cannot help offering it to outsiders who are prepared to do this.

These are the formal grounds which have been laid before us just to say that they will have no confidence in the present Ministry. In fact, there is no substance in any of the grounds.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—After 18 long months, you did not have confidence in the present Ministry.

Sri F. H. MOHSIN.—It is an internal question, anyway. Now that we have compromised, that has caused jealousy in you and nothing more.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—This compromise is purely an election stunt.

Sri F. H. MOHISIN.—Our compromise, our solidarity has been a matter of threat to you and you want to take advantage of this in abusing us for uniting oursleves. Is it a sin to unite ourselves?

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIAH.—Not at the cost of the State.

Sri F. H. MOHISIN.—As regards the administration of the Police, some of my friends have remarked that there might have been some excesses somewhere. Of course, my friends may say about the horrible incident. In fact, I have brought it to the notice of the Chief Minister, but that does not mean that the Chief Minister has kept quiet over the affair. He has taken action in dealing with the situation. All those officers responsible for such excesses have been kept under suspension and an enquiry has been instituted by the Chief Minister. Not only that; actually charge-sheets have been filed before the Magistrate as regards those persons. I do not wish to say anything further, because they are matters of *subjudice* at present. There might be some over acts by the Police, but the Government is there to take care and the Government has been very vigilant in these matters and if there be any need to strengthen the control over the Police, the Chief Minister is always ready. Now we are having Sri Channabasappa for he is known for integrity and able administration.

Sri. M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Is that the reason why you changed the portfolio ?

F. H. MOHISIN.—It may be for better administration even. Of course, Sri Channabasappa will deal with it in a very able manner.

There have been allegations of interference in the matter of justice and one of my friends has referred to condoning the sentence of death passed on one person from Bijapur. There is the Constitution which gives the right for the Government to do such a thing. Of course, my friends on the Opposite side cannot tolerate even the exercise of a right given to the Government. I do not know why there should be a provision in the Constitution itself. They have not interference in giving the sentence; they have not directed the Judges to give the sentence. They have just used power in a judicious manner. Government have to exercise their right in matters which they think best and they

(SRI F. H. MOHISIN)

have used such a right and if they have used such a right in a judicious manner, I do know what complaint there might be from the Opposition. Of course, it is only a matter which they want to make a ground though it has no substance.

Anyway, I might only end by saying that the grounds mentioned in this motion are *mala fide*, are only intended for making an advertisement for the election propaganda and they have no substance. Government is going on well with the administration. With these words I close my speech.

MR. SPEAKER.—Now the House rises and will meet on Monday at 1 p.m.

The House adjourned at Forty-Five Minutes past Twelve of the Clock to meet again at One of the Clock on Monday the 6th March 1961.

WD 5798—GPB—(L.A. New Br.)—500—24-11-66